1-1-1983

Democracy and personal autonomy in the Puerto Rican school system : a socio-historical survey and critique of educational development.

Roamé Torres-González
University of Massachusetts Amherst

DEMOCRACY AND PERSONAL AUTONOMY IN THE PUERTO RICAN SCHOOL SYSTEM: A SOCIO-HISTORICAL SURVEY AND CRITIQUE OF EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

A Dissertation Presented

By

Roamé Torres-González

Submitted to the Graduate School of the University of Massachusetts in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

September 1983

School of Education

DEMOCRACY AND PERSONAL AUTONOMY IN
THE PUERTO RICAN SCHOOL SYSTEM:
A SOCIO-HISTORICAL SURVEY AND
CRITIQUE OF EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

A Dissertation Presented

By

Roamé Torres-González

Approved as to style and content by:

Thomas Hutchinson, Chairperson of Committee

Gloria Figueroa de Guevara, Member

Herbert Gintis, Member

Mario D. Fantini, Dean
School of Education

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am particularly indebted to Tom Hutchinson for his crucial help, support and encouragement in bringing this work to completion. Many thanks to Gloria Figueroa de Guevara for her support and confidence in my work, and to Herb Gintis, whose teachings and ideas helped shape the emancipatory concerns of this study.

I would like to express my profound gratitude to Angel Quintero Alfaro, who as a teacher and friend initiated me in the reflections and investigations that led to the writing of this work.

"Muchas gracias" to Rosa C. Arrufat and the staff of the library of the Department of Education of Puerto Rico for their helpful assistance; and to Zayda E. Santos, for her excellent job in deciphering and typing the manuscript.

I am very grateful to my roomates at Allen Place--Claudia, Peggy and Argeo--who provided much comfort, encouragement and friendship, especially during my frequent moments of personal and dissertation blues.

I owe more than I can express to Lourdes Mattei and Nancy Sugarman, compañeras whose love and struggles

enriched and deepened my humanity as well as the libertarian and egalitarian concerns which orient my life and work.

My profound gratitude to my parents and to Matití is reflected in the dedication. Their love and affection, and that of my sister and brothers, lighted for me the end of the tunnel.

PREFACE

The original purpose of this study was to examine the actual role and prospects of formal educational institutions in Puerto Rico in the development of its people's capacities and attitudes for personal autonomy and democratic participation. However, soon after the investigation for this dissertation began, it became obvious that its overall plan was too ambitious and that various of its proposed research topics would have to be pursued in future works. Moreover, it became also increasingly clear that among the proposed topics, the one referring to the socio-historical overview of the Puerto Rican school system required first attention for it was designed to provide the necessary historical, socio-economic and political background for understanding the actual role and prospects of the formal educational system in fostering or constraining the development of a libertarian and democratic culture in Puerto Rico. But even such a socio-historical overview proved too ambitious, and further delimitations were required.

At this point, what appeared most feasible for this dissertation was a critical socio-historical overview of the Island's educational system covering the whole period

of Spanish colonial rule (1508-1930) and the first 32 years of U.S. colonial rule (1898-1930) and focusing in the historical interrelationships between the school system and its political and economic context. More specifically, this study proposes to survey the ways in which some of the principal power and privilege configurations or forms of domination which prevailed in the political and economic spheres of the Island during that period (or some extension of that period)--namely, colonialism (in its diverse Spanish and U.S. variants), Catholicism, racism, patriarchy, capitalism, bureaucracy and liberal representative democracy--had shaped and had been shaped by the development of the school system.

Chapter I presents the socio-historical perspective which guides the analytical approach of this study and reviews the relevant literature on the history of education in Puerto Rico. Chapters II and III survey the whole period of Spanish colonial rule on the Island: the former from the beginning of the colonization process to the first half of the 18th century, that is, up to just before the time of the Bourbons' reforms in the Spanish empire; and the latter, from that epoch to the end of Spanish colonial rule in 1898. Chapters IV and V cover the first three decades of U.S. colonial rule: the former, the period of the military regime (1898-1900); and the latter, the

period of the civil regimes marked by the 1900 Foraker Act and the 1917 Jones Act and going up to the beginnings of the Great Depression in the late 1920s. The final Chapter provides a summary and conclusions.

ABSTRACT

DEMOCRACY AND PERSONAL AUTONOMY IN
THE PUERTO RICAN SCHOOL SYSTEM:
A SOCIO-HISTORICAL SURVEY AND
CRITIQUE OF EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

(September 1983)

Roamé Torres-González, B.A., University of Puerto Rico
Ed.D., University of Massachusetts

Directed by: Professor Thomas E. Hutchinson

This study seeks to examine the interrelationships in Puerto Rico between the school system and the political and economic spheres from the beginning of Spanish colonization (1508) up through the first three decades of U.S. rule (1898-1930). For the analysis, a critical socio-historical approach is employed which focuses on the ways in which the power configurations which prevailed on the Island during that period, shaped and were shaped by the developments in insular schooling. It is proposed that one of the main advantages of such an approach is that it may provide a better understanding of the socio-historical factors that have limited or facilitated the development of spheres of personal autonomy and democratic interaction in the Puerto Rican society, including its school system.

The study shows first that under both Spanish and U.S. rule, schooling was characterized by a changing but never-

theless class elitist, patriarchal and racist structure; by its indoctrinating role (mainly in securing loyalty for the colonizing State and its institutions); and by its vocational orientation (in training for the liberal professions as well as, under Spain, for the Church clergy, and under the U.S., for the colonial State, educational and capitalist bureaucracies). In addition, it shows that while schooling expanded slightly during the 19th century with the growth of the agro-export capitalist economy, the Spanish colonial apparatus and the creole liberal sectors, no significant school expansion occured until the period of U.S. rule. It is argued, moreover, that the main impetus for school expansion came from the strong drive of U.S. authorities to "Americanize" the Islanders and socialize them into a new colonial order, partially liberal democratic in character, but increasingly centralized, bureaucratized and commercialized. It is also argued that this drive was reinforced by the rising demands for mass schooling by an increasingly proletarized and organized working class, as well as by the rising demands of a growing intelligentsia and a declining, U.S.-displaced, local agro-bourgeoisie, for school expansion as a source both of elitist employment and training (in its secondary and university levels) for the liberal and technocratic professions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

C H A P T E R I

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The Socio-Historical Approach

In surveying the historical interrelationships in Puerto Rico between the school system and its political and economic context, this study employs a socio-historical approach which borrows from diverse sources in critical social theory.[1] The "critical" component of such theoretical orientation points to two distinct though related concerns in social inquiry. The first refers to the normative thrust of social inquiry which in this work is directed to the examination of the power and stratification structures of the educational, political and economic spheres from the vantage point of an emancipatory ideal derived from a tradition committed to the replacement of all forms of social domination by forms of interaction which allow for the greatest degree of personal autonomy and democratic participation in the diverse spheres of social life.[2] As can be seen, this critical component refers to the principal purpose of the larger project mentioned in the preface. Thus, within the limits of this dissertation, the emancipatory ideal would serve as the

underlying thrust in "critically" examining the power and stratification aspects of the educational, political and economic institutions of Puerto Rico.

The second sense of the "critical" component refers to the concerns in social theory of understanding those social forces and factors in society which tend to shape its power and stratification structure.[3] This understanding is also of course a fundamental concern of the first sense of critical social theory, for it is geared to shed light on those forces and structures in society that might enhance or limit the development of democratic institutions, practices, skills and attitudes. It is this second sense of critical social theory which will be examined in the following discussion of the socio-historical perspective.

In general, this component of the socio-historical approach presupposes a view of societies, of their institutions, practices, tools, norms and meanings--and hence of their systems and means of political decision, administration and coercion; of economic production and distribution; of communication and education; of kinship, sexual relationships and nurturance--as developed, formed and transformed throughout time by the actions and interactions of human beings. At the same time, it entails that human beings are deeply shaped and conditioned not merely by their natural constitution and environment--which they also

transform (or could transform) in some degree--but also by the socio-historically inherited products, that is, institutions, practices, tools and meanings, of past human actions and interactions.[4]

The socio-historical approach also entails that these actions and interactions have been carried historically by individuals and social groups in hierarchical relationships of domination and subordination, and hence with unequal, socially determined power resources to intervene in the natural and sociocultural world, and thus to shape and transform nature and the various inherited institutions, practices, tools, norms and meanings of society. Indeed, a basic assumption of this study is that the distribution of power among the participants of social actions is one of the most important variables in determining the form and content of social outcomes and, more generally, the social stratification of any society, including its distribution of wealth, prestige and socially valued knowledge. Power may be understood accordingly as the general transformative capacity of human agency, that is to say, as the capability of human actions to intervene in the world so as to alter their course and produce definite outcomes, including intended ones.[5] This broad sense refers to human transformative capacity as applied to objects (whether natural or human products) or to other human actors. But in this

work the term "power" will be more frequently employed in a more restricted sense to refer specifically to the transformative capacity of human actors in their interactions and relationships with others, that is, as Giddens puts it, "as the capability of actors to secure outcomes where the realization of these outcomes depends upon the agency of others."[6] It is in this latter social, relational sense of power that one may say that in certain situations some actors or groups have or exercise power over others, or in other words, that some actors have or exercise domination, control or influence over others.

Whether in its broad transformative sense or in its narrower relational sense as domination, the use of power in action or interaction can be understood, as Giddens suggests, in terms of the resources or facilities which the participants bring to and mobilize so as to influence or control the course of the action or, as in the case of social interactions, to influence or control the conduct of others who are parties in the interaction.[7] Such power resources can be of a variety of kinds: they might include, for example, material objects (e.g. weapons, food, land, equipment, material means of communication and transportation, etc.); rules and symbol systems (e.g. norms, rituals, ideologies, stock of knowledge or information, etc.); skills (e.g. physical, technical, managerial, legal,

ideological or communicative, etc.) or, combining the previous ones, organizations (e.g. the military, the police, the legal administrative apparatus of government, the schools, the church, the mass media, the private economic enterprise, etc.). These resources, moreover, could be used in a variety of different and combined manners in order to influence the behavior of others in the power interaction: some might be employed as negative sanctions, as coercions or punishments (physical or otherwise) like, for example, by using or by threatening to use weapons, the police, the military or the legal system against them; others might be employed as positive sanctions or rewards (material or otherwise), like for instance, by giving higher wages, higher positions in the administrative hierarchy, higher grades, or by guaranteeing assurance of religious salvation; and others might be used to ideologically legitimate or justify the relationships of domination, that is, to secure ideological compliance or agreement from the subordinate actors with their subordination to the powers of the dominant actors. Power resources, moreover, can be used for a variety of ends. They can be used to maximize power for its own sake in any of its forms, to maximize wealth or any economic advantage, to maximize social privilege or honor, or to maximize a combination of the above.

It is important to remember that power resources as well as the capabilities to use them are either the accumulative products of past socio-historical developments --that is, socio-historically developed artifacts, means of production, technologies, skills, stocks of knowledge, normative structures, organizations--or natural resources or capabilities which are amplified, shaped or constraint by such products and by socio-historical processes in general. (The latter, of course, are also conditioned, constrained or enabled by the former, that is, by both the physical nature of humans and their physical natural environment.) In other words, the use of power in social relationships or in other interactions would depend not merely on the availability of certain kinds of resources but on their level of development: e.g. the level of development of the technologies of production, weaponry, communication, etc., or the level of expansion and centralization of the state apparatus, the private economic enterprises, the mass media, the school system and so on.

It is, moreover, worth emphasizing that the outcomes of power resources as well as their distribution in society, are not the results of one-way power relationships by which the dominant actors merely impose their wants and interests over passive subordinate actors. Rather, they are the result of two-way power (or perhaps even more

complex interactions) relationships where the participants in subordinate positions and hence, with less power resources compared to those in dominant positions, can also affect to some degree or other--relative, of course, to their actual power resources--the outcome of the social interaction even though the participants with greater power resources have better chances of affecting such outcomes according to their wants and interests.

This aspect of power relationships brings into focus another closely related aspect of social relationships and actions: this is their conflict-potentiality.[9] Participants in social interactions, even when they are in relationships of domination or subordination, could indeed share similar wants, interests or values in a given course of action, but their wants, interests or values may also not coincide; hence they might be in conflict, a possibility which may in fact happen frequently, though certainly in differing degrees, in any form of power relationships. What this means is that any attempt by some actors--even dominant ones--to influence or control the behavior of others, to impose their wants, interests or values on others, to coerce or to sanction them (positively or negatively), or to secure from them ideological legitimacy, compliance or agreement with such attempts, can always be a matter of struggle, and, hence subject to be contested,

resisted, challenged, and modified by those others. In short, socio-historical outcomes and developments--artifacts, technologies, skills, stocks of knowledge and information, systems of rules and values, and organizations--should be seen as reflecting not just the wants, interests and values of the dominant actors but rather the sometimes ambiguous, conflicting or contradictory results of interactions and struggles between actors with asymmetrical power resources to realize their wants, interests and values.

Having in mind these notions of social actions as power-conflict interactions and of social outcomes as the historically situated products of such interactions, it is appropriate to consider now some crucial aspects of the distribution of power resources. It appears that power resources in all historical societies, including the most egalitarian, such as those with a rudimentary division of labor based principally in kinship relationships, have been distributed unequally among different categories of individuals in society. Throughout history, moreover, the unequal distribution of power resources seems to have taken the form of an increasingly differentiated, hierarchized and power stratified--and, it is worth repeating, socio-historically constituted and frequently conflictive--division of roles, tasks and geographical habitats that are

assigned to and/or occupied by different categories of individuals. On the other hand, the distribution of power resources--and consequently, of wealth, privilege, knowledge, and other socially valued rewards--among individual members of society and, hence, the differentiation and hierarchization of the social division of labor, appears to have been done historically on the basis of a variety of criteria, including among the most important age, sex-gender, ethnic identity;[10] property-ownership (or exclusion thereof) of the means of production; possession of skills or of educational qualifications; and legal-political status or position in relationship to the State (including the military and, when applicable, the State Church) apparatuses. Each of the social divisions resulting from these different criteria entails distinct forms of power-conflict relationships between different kinds of social groupings ranged in positions of domination and subordination. It is in reference to some of these criteria and forms of differentiation and hierarchization that one may speak, for example, of patriarchy (i.e. male domination);[11] of colonialism, racism or ethnic domination;[12] of capitalism (i.e. domination by the owners of economic capital[13]); of meritocracy, technocracy or bureaucracy (i.e. domination by those who possess some type or other of school-certified "expert" or technical

knowledge);[14] and of representative liberal democracy (i.e. domination by officials or representatives in government elected through universal suffrage from among competing elites)[15] as distinct forms of domination as well as distinct principles of legitimation (that is, as symbol-systems or discourses used to justify the different forms of domination).[16]

It should be pointed out that one of the major assumptions of this study is that the various set of criteria, forms and principles of differentiation and hierarchization mentioned above refer to distinct social phenomena which may be irreducible to each other and that, for the same reason, may operate and persist in societies independently of the existence of the others.[17] It is assumed accordingly that, hierarchized power-conflict divisions on the basis of age, or of sex, ethnic differences, or on meritocratic criteria may have endured or could endure in societies without the existence of capitalism, and that the converse--or any combination thereof--may also have or could happen. Historically, however, each set of criteria, form and principle of domination not only has been affected and modified by other power-conflicts in society, but also has been in operation alongside or in conjunction with those others corresponding sets of criteria, forms and principles of domination in

varying degrees of reciprocal interpenetration and relative autonomy, at times in conflict or cutting across each other, and at other times in complementary or mutually reinforcing ways. One can find historical examples where for instance ethnic (or racial) divisions cut across social divisions based on property ownership, occupational positions, or class divisions or conversely where ethnic and class divisions converge and reinforce each other.[18] It could even be argued on the other hand, that some forms of domination not only have reinforced each other but have also shared some meanings, values or ideas in their particular legitimating principles. This indeed may be especially true of capitalism (at least in its liberal form), meritocracy-bureaucracy and liberal democracy all of which drew significantly from the same liberal and rationalistic tradition of the 18th century European Enlightenment and bourgeois revolutions. Notwithstanding this, it could also be argued that the various social struggles and developments of the 19th and 20th century have given these diverse modern forms of domination and principles of legitimation a clearer orientation as relatively autonomous phenomena which could in fact enter in conflict and contradiction with each other.

In a sense, this study can be seen as an overview tracing the ways in which various sets of forms, criteria

and principles of domination have operated in the educational development of Puerto Rico since its colonization by Spain in the 16th century and up to the first three decades of U.S. colonial rule during this century. At one level, it may be said that the concern here is to examine the differing impact on such development of both Spanish and U.S. colonialism. But obviously the forms of domination which prevailed in the Island during its colonial subordination to these metropolitan societies were not limited to that entailed specifically by the relationships of control of the state apparatuses of both Spain and the U.S. over the Puerto Rican society as a whole. Within the broader context provided by the colonial power relationships other forms of domination operated in the Island in varying degrees in different epochs, some as transformed variants of modes of domination which had been established in Europe and Puerto Rico (and perhaps in most of the world) before the European colonial expansion of the 16th century (e.g. patriarchy, communalism, feudalism, monarchical absolutism or Catholic ecclesiastical control); others as new modes of domination which evolved in Europe since or after its colonial expansion and which were transplanted in some degree or other to their overseas possessions through the colonization process and the colonial struggles which accompanied that process (e.g.

capitalism, in its mercantile form by Spain; or liberal capitalism, liberal democracy and meritocracy, to some limited extent, through the colonial struggles of the 19th century under Spain and to a greater extent, through the colonization and colonial struggles under the U.S.). Thus, the colonization of Puerto Rico in its changing historical character under both Spain and the U.S. can be examined in terms of the complex and evolving interrelationships between diverse, but also evolving, forms of domination. Along those lines, this study will be concerned then in examining not just the impact of colonialism per se over Puerto Rico's educational development but rather the specific and combined impacts upon such development, of colonialism and other forms of domination, focusing most particularly on patriarchy, racism, Catholicism, capitalism, bureaucracy, and representative liberal democracy.

Thus far socio-historical actions have been seen mostly as the agency of actors in power and (potentially) conflict interactions. The preceding discussion also suggests that participants of social actions are differentiated into hierarchized categories of actors according to a variety of criteria, forms and principles of power stratification. Such criteria, forms and principles of stratification are important bases of group formations, that is, of groupings of people sharing certain common

experiences and conditions--including similar relationships with other groupings segmented on the bases of the same criteria--and who, in varying degrees, may on account of these common positions, conditions and experiences, associate in common ways with each other, develop common meanings, values and interests, and organize themselves (politically, economically or culturally) to act upon, advance or defend their common interests in society. These group formations can be, accordingly, not only crucial determining factors of the behavior of individual actors but also important collective agents of social action.

In keeping with the previous discussion, then, groupings may be formed (and hierarchized) on the basis of age, sex-gender, ethnic-national (or racial) identification, of socio-economic or socio-occupational groupings (or classes), differentiated both on the basis of property ownership and educational or technical qualifications; of grouping stratified in terms of their legal-political status (like for instance, feudal estates or alternately, those groupings differentiated as "citizens" and "non-citizens" or "aliens"). It should be emphasized that the level of group formation in any of the above categories may vary greatly in terms, for instance, of the degree of cultural homogeneity, of recognition of common interests, or of organized activities. It is conceivable, accordingly, that

a particular criterion for the distribution of power resources--say, for example, private property ownership and/or the possession of educational qualifications--may operate in societies by dividing and hierarchizing people into socio-economic or socio-occupational class groups, without giving rise to more than just a minimum degree of group formation in terms of class culture, recognized class interests and class organized activities. Like in the case of other kind of social groupings, the formation of class groupings can vary to a great extent depending on a number of historically variable social conditions which may enhance or hinder the degree of mutual interaction and association between members of particular groupings and the level of visibility--to use Giddèn's term--[19] of common group characteristics, interests and differences with the other groupings with which they interact. The level of class or group formation may be affected, for example, by the opportunities that members of a particular class or group have for interacting and associating with other class or group members in work, the community or neighborhood where they reside, in the school where they attend or send their children. It also depends, for sure, on the degree of control that the members of a particular class or group have over those capabilities and resources which serve to articulate and assert, both symbolically and organiza-

tionally, their class or group cultures and interests in society, and to oppose or resist the imposition of the cultures and interests of other classes or groups. In other words, the level of group or class formation may also vary in relationship to the position of the various groups or classes in the social power structure, a condition which might favor to a large degree, class or group formation among the dominant ones and hinder the level of development of class or group formation in the subordinate ones.

Another important set of conditions which might affect the development of group and class formation, is that which refers to the interrelationships in societies between groupings differentiated and hierarchized on the basis of distinct criteria. It was suggested before that though each of the above mentioned criteria of differentiation and hierarchization and their corresponding power and conflict-related social groupings could be understood as distinct social phenomena which cannot be reduced to each other and which could operate and persist in societies independently of the existence of others, each of those criteria may nevertheless operate in conjunction with some of the others in varying, overlapping relationships of relative independence or reciprocal interdependence, at times possibly cutting across or in conflict with each other or, at other times, closely intertwined with and

reinforcing each other. Accordingly, it may happen that in some circumstances ethnic (or racial) divisions and group formations cut across class divisions and hinder the formation of class groupings while in other circumstances ethnic divisions and class divisions may converge and, as a result, accentuate the formation of class groupings or ethnic groupings or both.[20]

At this juncture, it could be advanced that the long history of colonial subordination of Puerto Rico first to Spain and later to the U.S., and the insertion, through this colonial process, of the Island into the developing world-capitalist economy since the 16th century onward, gave rise to a manifold division of labor with a variety of cross-cutting and at times reinforcing power-conflict relationships. However, as shall be seen in subsequent Chapters, of the various power-conflict relationships those based on ethnic divisions (primarily in terms of racial and national-territorial identification) and socio-economic (or socio-occupational) classes, have provided the major source of group formation in terms of articulated group identity and of organized collective (political, economic and cultural) actions and struggles. It is worth anticipating here, nonetheless, that since the second half of the 19th century, politically oriented actions and struggles have been for the most part channelled through the agency

of political parties organized mainly around their positions with respect to the colonial status of the Island. As in other more liberal democratic societies, political parties in the Island became, specially after the U.S. occupation in 1898, important instruments in the distribution of political patronage (that is, of distributing governmental positions, privileges or resources on the basis of loyalty to the party or its leadership) even though their access to the control of the State apparatus was limited to some degree or other by the colonial status of the Island. As such, and because of their strong political orientation with respect to the colonial status, political parties in Puerto Rico emerged as important instruments not only in the distribution of governmental positions and resources but also in the development of diverse forms of territorial and national collective identification among diverse sectors of the population of the Island, forms ranging from the most radical "nationalistic", through middle of the road "autonomists" to the most radical "assimilationist" vis a vis the metropolitan colonial powers. In this role of forming what may be called ethno-national groupings and in their overall activities, insular political parties appealed and received support from an electorate that cut-across class divisions drawing from diverse bourgeois, professional, bureaucratic

and working class sectors.

Interestingly, as will be seen in Chapters IV and V, the principal educational controversies during the first three decades of U.S. rule over Puerto Rico, controversies in which the political parties played an important role, were for the most part around such ethno-colonial issues as the "Americanization" and English language policies of the colonial government. Yet, it should be noted that, political parties were--and have been--for the most part patriarchally and class hierarchized organizations dominated by diverse sectors of the male bourgeoisie and the professional intelligentsia who largely because of their different positions in the colonial division of labor developed different orientations and interests (not only economic but also political and cultural) toward the colonial status of the Island) that were articulated in rival ethno-national movements. An exception, to some extent, to what has been said about political parties in Puerto Rico was the Socialist Party founded in 1915--and even before that, the politically oriented trade union organization known as the Federación Libre de Trabajadores (FLT) from which the Socialist Party emerged--which was in its origins basically a working class organization both in terms of its leadership and supporters and primarily oriented to advance and defend the class interests of the

artisans and proletariat; however, as shall be seen in Chapter V, this Party became over the years not only increasingly hierarchized and dominated by non-working class leaders--primarily lawyers--but also increasingly involved in the struggles around the colonial question, including around the "Americanization" and English-language policies mentioned before, becoming in the process an important instrument in the development of collective "assimilitationist" orientations toward the U.S.

In examining the ways that the various forms of power-relationships mentioned above have shaped educational developments in Puerto Rico, this study will be looking most particularly at the developments in the structures of the colonial State apparatus and the capitalist economy of the Island. The relevance of these organizations for the concerns of this study resides not only in that they have been historically the major institutional sources and channels of coercive and material power resources in society, and hence, the major focuses and sites of power struggles for the different social groupings--especially of course for those differentiated on the basis of ethno-colonial, liberal democratic, capitalistic and even meritocratic, technocratic or bureaucratic principles--of Puerto Rico during the period covered here. But also because on that basis these organizations have been, on the

one hand, the major institutional source of the material and legal-authoritative means for the establishment and expansion of formal educational institutions in Puerto Rico, and on the other, the principal instruments or channels by which different and competing social groupings have pressured for, resisted or shaped the expansion of formal educational institutions.

There is, moreover, another kind of institutional organization which requires some attention here, that is the Catholic Church, for it has played a considerably active role in shaping the development of educational institutions in Puerto Rico especially during the period of Spanish colonial rule. In fact, as shall be seen in Chapters II and III, during most of the period of Spanish colonial rule in Puerto Rico, formal educational institutions in the Island as well as in Spain and elsewhere in colonial Spanish America, were principally established by and under the direct control of the Catholic Church or its religious orders. But it should be advanced in this context that the Catholic Church in Puerto Rico and the other Spanish American colonies were under the direct control of the Spanish State and operated for all practical purposes as a branch of the colonial government providing not merely Christian evangelization and ministry but also moral and ideological legitimation for the absolutist

colonial government. At any rate, it would not be until after the Spanish State began to enter into conflict with the Catholic Church in the 18th and 19th centuries, and especially after the bourgeois and intellectual sectors in both the metropolis and the colonies--as well as the small, but growing urban working classes in Spain--began to pressure for the reorganization of the Spanish State (the colonial apparatus) along secular, liberal democratic, liberal capitalist and meritocratic-bureaucratic lines, that the expansion of formal education in Puerto Rico received a significant impetus. And indeed as shall be shown in Chapters IV and V, it would not be until after the definite separation of the State and the Catholic Church--and hence, the separation of the Catholic Church from control of Puerto Rican education--in 1898 with the establishment on the Island of a new form of colonial rule by an expansionist, capitalist, liberal democratic and Protestant society with an increasingly centralized meritocratic-bureaucratic State apparatus, that the real expansion of mass public educational system in Puerto Rico actually took place.

The importance of institutionalized religions as a factor in the establishment and expansion of schools, and the combination of religious and political motives in justifying such developments, is of course not peculiar to

Puerto Rico, the Spanish Empire or to Catholicism. One only has to remember how closely associated if not fused were the Church and State in the formation of all literate civilizations and how instrumental was this fusion--and conversely, how much the State-Church depended to sustain and increase its power--in the development of literacy and of the specialized institutions of formal education geared particularly for the training of scribes, clerics and administrators of the State-Church bureaucracies. With reference to modern developments, one must of course remember the far greater importance that Protestanism, with its not lesser ties with the State (whether in the Northern European nation-states or the provinces of colonial U.S.), gave to the reading of the Bible, and, consequently to the expansion of popular primary education.[21]

On the other hand, it should be noted that Catholic-sponsored education in Puerto Rico, like Protestant or any other religious education elsewhere, has been used not only for religious or State related purposes--whether ideological (e.g. for the spread and preservation of the religious faith, and for the legitimation of royal absolutism--like in the case of Spain--or of theocratic governments, like in some of the states of colonial North America) or vocational (e.g. in the training of the cadres of the Church and State bureaucracy)--but also, and in

conjunction with these other purposes, for providing non-practical, non-vocational, prestigious education for the upper classes as the basis for their class status emulation in society. With the increasing secularization of the nation-states and the parallel expansion of capitalist commercial and, later, industrial activities in the Western world, including Spain and its colonies--though for reasons that will be outlined in later Chapters, such processes were slower and less forceful in Spain and its colonies and particularly so in Spanish Puerto Rico as compared to other Western European nation-states and the U.S.--the growing (male) bourgeois, intellectual and bureaucratic sectors of the upper classes provided a still greater impetus for the expansion of the school system, an impetus which was accentuated by the emergence, in Europe throughout the 19th century and in Puerto Rico since the turn of the 20th century, of an increasingly articulated organized working class movement. In the case of Puerto Rico, as shall be seen in Chapters III and I, all these social pressures converged with the far greater pressure for expanded schooling represented by the "Americanizing" efforts of the U.S. colonial apparatus.

It is worth advancing in this context that the different educational pressures from these diverse groupings and organizations were also in themselves

motivated and/or rationalized by a variety of reasons. Thus, for example, one sees the emerging Puerto Rican bourgeoisie and intelligentsia demanding the establishment of secondary and post secondary schools to secure monopoly access for both elite culture and high income professions, but also demanding, at the same time, the expansion of compulsory public primary education, to ensure the political, moral or labor discipline of the rising working classes, to prepare productive and good citizens, or even, in some cases, to allegedly provide equal educational (and, through this, equal socio-economic) opportunity to every citizen and train them accordingly for liberal democratic participation in the political sphere. On the side of the working classes, one sees their motivations as overlapping with some of those of the bourgeoisie and intelligentsia and articulated in the same liberal democratic and meritocratic language of some of these--e.g. demands for technical and industrial skills, for equality in educational opportunities, for training in liberal democratic self-government--but at the same time pressuring, with greater insistance than the bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia, and occassionally in conflict with some sectors of these, for kinds of education which they thought were to favor particularly the working classes--e.g. primary education, trade and technical education, and even English-

language instruction (the latter a concern which they shared with the pro-U.S. statehood factions of the bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia). And from the top, that is as of 1898, from the U.S. colonial apparatus, one would see not only pressures but concrete efforts to establish in Puerto Rico--a society which as shall be elaborated later, was considered by many U.S. colonial officials ethnically if not racially backward or inferior--an "American" public school system along with other colonial structures designed to transplant U.S. Anglo-Protestant, liberal democratic, meritocratic and capitalist institutions to Puerto Rico and to educate the "natives" for some future self-government. It is also worth advancing here that the concrete developments of such institutions in Puerto Rico would, to a great extent, parallel those in the U.S.; however, the process of colonization will be shaped along very distinctive lines, particularly in terms of the higher centralized and increasingly bureaucratized colonial political and educational structures as well as in terms of the domination of U.S. corporations over an increasingly monocultural, export-oriented agrarian economy.

An important result of the U.S. colonizing educational efforts was the massive incorporation of women into the educational system both as students and as teachers (especially at the primary level) but though this process

was certainly more coeducational than any sponsored by the Spanish colonial regime, and more advantageous for women in terms of educational and occupational advancement, it nevertheless continued the institutionalization of patriarchal relationships in the coeducational structure, legitimating women's subordinate position in the home and channelling them to the subordinate and lower paying positions in the professional, clerical and manual labor occupations. However, the massive incorporation of women into the educational and occupational system also facilitated the development of greater feminist consciousness and militancy among women as was particularly evident in the suffragist movement of the second and third decades of this century. A movement, interestingly enough which in addition to demanding women's suffrage, pressed for greater female literacy and for greater equality of educational opportunity for women.

In large measure, the various kinds of social demands for formal education mentioned above have been mobilized by means of both political (e.g. the colonial state and political parties) and economic (e.g. private business and corporation, but also trade unions and occupational groups) organizations and resources while on the other hand these demands have been to a great extent formulated in terms of political and economic ends (e.g. to achieve political

order or to prepare for good citizenship and political self-government; to achieve labor discipline, to improve productive and technical skills; or to provide "vocational" training not just for occupations in the private economy but also in the State bureaucracy and the public and private schools. As suggested before, there have been other kinds of ends sought with respect to formal education --e.g. religious instruction, status or prestige, emulation, or, one may add, the acquisition of knowledge for the sake of knowledge; but even though these aims cannot be fully reduced to political and economic (or vocational) kinds of purposes, they have appeared historically closely connected with the others and often, like in the case of religion mentioned above, reinforcing each other.

It should be emphasized that in examining the connections between, on the one hand, the political and the economic orders, and on the other, formal educational institutions in terms of the various forms of power relations and struggles shaping their historical development, educational organizations will not be seen as passive instruments of power relationships originating outside of the educational sphere in the external specialized institutions of the State or the private economy. It is true that the establishment and development of formal educational institutions depended (and depends) on the

development of conditions outside of its control; most notably, the development on the one hand of a material social surplus that could be used for the support of teachers, the maintenance and/or building classrooms, the production of school materials, etc. and on the other of a political order that at least would not impede by the use of the State's own coercive power the establishment of formal instruction and that would guarantee that others will not impede that possibility. Moreover, it is evident that modern educational systems, including Puerto Rico's, have become either a subsidiary agency of the State, particularly as public schools, or as in the case of private schools, under its supervisory, regulatory or licensing power. The respective degree of subordination and dependence of educational organizations to the State and the private economy has been historically variable but in any event such relationships have been two ways, for in the same process, and perhaps because of those relationships, educational systems (including again that of Puerto Rico) have become in modern times one of the central agencies for both producing cultural legitimations for the State and, more broadly, for the dominant social order--a role increasingly delegated to public schools especially after the separation of the State and the Church and with the growing secularization of society--as well as for the

allocation of people in the occupational division of labor.[22] For these reasons schools have at the same time become important arenas of power struggle in society, where different social groupings compete not merely to gain access to socially valuable knowledge and skills just for the sake of it, or even to gain social prestige on such a basis, but also to, on the one hand, gain or monopolize access to the more powerful, higher paying and/or more prestigious jobs in society, and to, on the other hand, determine the character of the cultural legitimations of the State and the general social order. It will be shown throughout this study that the forms of power relations and struggles mentioned above, that is, patriarchy, ethno-nationalism, capitalism, meritocracy-bureaucracy and liberal democracy have been among the most crucial factors in shaping the development of Puerto Rico's schools system as one of the principal if not the principal social agency of occupational allocation as well as of power legitimation.

Alternative Historical Perspectives

It should be clear by now that the socio-historical perspective which guides this dissertation is radically different from the dominant tradition in Western social theory, that is, from what has been variously referred to

as functionalist, structural-functionalist, social order, consensus, or system theory perspective. This theoretical tradition, which has Durkheim and Parsons as its most prominent formulators, analyses human actions and institutions in terms of their contribution to the integration and the orderly and productive functioning of society.[23] Indeed, in this perspective, not only the social whole is given priority over its parts and members, but its "needs" and "interests" are seen as controlling or governing the purposes and actions of its human agents: in other words, human actions and institutions are examined according to the "role" they played in maintaining or reproducing the social whole. Accordingly, this perspective assumes that societies are totalities with common, socially binding, cultural or moral systems with consensually shared values, beliefs and orientations. Moreover, it sees social power hierarchies and irregularities not merely as necessary (i.e. functional) for the stability and productive functioning of the entire collectivity, but ultimately advantageous or rewarding for all social groupings including those in the subordinated strata of the social hierarchy. In this perspective, power is usually treated as a marginal or residual problem and when treated at all it is seen essentially not as a form of domination or a potentially conflictive relationship whereby individuals and groupings

in power impose their particular interests over other individuals or groupings; but as a functional, neutral and legitimate forms of authority exercized in the collective interest of society. While it underplays power conflicts, functionalism allows for the existence of conflicts in society, but these are seen not as conflicts between groups with divergent interests, but rather as tensions deriving from the lack of integration of the particular interests or purposes of individuals or groups in society with the moral standards and role configurations of the collectivity as a whole. Such lack of integration of the interests and normative standards of the collectivity--as dramatically evident in crime as much as in rebellion, revolution and all forms of dissent--is conceptualized by functionalists as "anomie", "deviance" or simply as disorder. It is then fundamental for the stability of any society, that it makes its established norms and role demands binding on its members not solely by means of the coercive (or, as functionalists prefer to say, regulatory) power of the legitimate sources of authority in society but also through the socialization of each individual member into the social order, a task that should be realized by all social spheres, but most specifically by the family, religion and, particularly so in modern societies, by schools. To function properly and to ensure their stability and

reproduction, these socializing spheres must effectively internalize in individuals the established values, norms and moral standards of society and trained them for the specific adult roles that they would perform in the prevailing social and technological division of labor.

It should be noted that while the functionalist perspective allows for changes in the social system, these are seen as orderly, evolutionary adaptations of the system or some of its parts, to institutional or technical innovations arising internally or borrowed (or diffused) from other systems. Thus, for instance, changes in the educational system are usually conceptualized as functional adaptations to technical innovations in the economy and the division of labor. Interestingly enough, functionalists view the modern industrial countries of the West, particularly the U.S., as the apex of evolutionary development in the world; thus these countries are seen as models of progress for other supposedly less advanced or developed countries, and their institutional (capitalist, meritocratic, bureaucratic and liberal democratic) and technological innovations are taken as the vantage point from which innovations in the less advanced or underdeveloped countries are judged to be evolutionarily progressive. These evolutionary innovations are not viewed as derivative from power conflicts and struggles in society or between

societies, or deriving for instance, from the conflicts generated by class, patriarchal or colonial relations, and rarely they involve drastic changes in the power and stratification structures. If there are conflicts in this scheme, they are seen as deriving from the resistance of some individuals, groups or even entire societies to the diffusion of these innovations, a resistance which is viewed in any case to their disadvantage since such innovations are seen as beneficial for the collectivity as a whole.

In short, the functionalist perspective not merely fails to provide an adequate framework for understanding power relations and conflicts in society or between societies, but, more important, it is generally apologetic of the actual configurations of power and privilege in the Western World, particularly that part of the world under the hegemony and influence of the U.S. and Western Europe.[27] Furthermore, though they might be critical of some societies, their criticism is mainly directed to point out the lack or "underdeveloped" character of these societies relative to the evolutionary advances of the U.S. and Western Europe.

It is important to note that the socio-historical approach followed in this study not only differs from the functionalist theoretical perspective but also from some

versions of the Marxist tradition. It should be said from the outset that classical Marxism provided one of the most important starting points for critical social theory, particularly in its critical analysis of capitalism as a socially pervasive form of domination, of the non-democratic and formal character of liberal democratic forms of government in capitalist societies, and of the power relationships, conflicts and contradictions endemic to capitalism and involved to some degree or other in its reproduction or transformation. However, in its classical and in most of its orthodox versions, Marxism has been characterized by some degree or other of economic reductionism which limits considerably its critical analytical capacity to understand the diverse sources and forms of power-conflict and domination in society.[24] The economic reductionism is shown in the way it has tended to explain socio-historical phenomena as primarily (or "ultimately",as some modern accounts, namely the structuralist ones, put it)[25] determined by the mode of production of society and its class structure, the latter conceived as a power conflict relationship between social groupings (classes) with differential property-relations to the means of production (basically either as property owners or non-property owners of the means of production). In other words, the functioning and evolution of society and its

institutions, its forms of power and domination, and its conflicts and contradictions, are seen, as principally and fundamentally rooted and conditioned by the prevailing mode of production and its class structure. Thus, for instance, the developments and functioning of the educational system in capitalist societies are seen as primarily shaped by the structure and changes of the capitalist mode of production, especially by the class conflicts and struggles which stem from its division of labor; while on the other hand, the educational system which is so determined is seen as playing a central role or function in the reproduction of the capitalist mode of production and its class based division of labor, that is, in the reproduction of capitalist domination.[26]

As has been indicated before, the socio-historical approach followed in this study, recognizes the fundamental importance of the economy--of the material resources, the means of production, the division of labor and the power conflicts and struggles associated with it--as well as more inclusive factors such as the demography, geography and natural habitat of a society as major conditioning factors of social pheomena, including among the latter the educational system. It recognizes also that class relationships are one of the principal forms of domination, conflicts and struggles in society (especially capitalist

society) that the educational system is an important arena of such conflicts and struggles and that it is profoundly shaped by them. However, this study's socio-historical approach recognizes at the same time that there are a number of non-economic spheres of human action (e.g. sexual, cultural, political) and forms of power relations and stratification in society which are relatively independent from the mode of production and its class structure in the sense that while they might be deeply conditioned by and highly intertwined with the latter, they cannot be solely or primarily explained by them. Thus, as was argued before, those forms of power relations and stratification based on gender, racial, ethnic or religious differentiation, or those based on the control of the State or Church apparatuses have their own dynamics, principles of legitimation and their own conditioning effects over other social phenomena (including the economy), and may persist in a society even though the particular mode of production and the particular class structure of that society are transformed. In other words, the existence, for instance, of patriarchal, ethnic, racial and state based (or colonial) forms of domination and stratification in capitalist societies cannot be explained as derived or determined solely or primarily from the capitalist forces of production and the capitalist class division of labor; that those

forms of domination and stratification have their own dynamics, their own principles of legitimation and their own conditioning effects on each other, over capitalist production and the division of labor, and over all other spheres of human action (including education); and, moreover, that to some degree or other they have antedated capitalism and may persist (and have persisted) in post-capitalist countries (e.g. socialist ones). Traditional Marxism, then, by reducing the various non-economic forms of domination to the economic structure, and indeed by suggesting that they would dissappear by the mere socialization of the means of production, fails to provide an adequate critical analysis of the different structures of domination in modern societies.

Another common feature of the traditional version of Marxism which is related to some extent to its economic reductionism and which is also at odds with the socio-historical approach of this study is the Marxist dichotomous model of the class structure.[27] According to this model, there are only two fundamental antagonistic classes in class divided societies, a dichotomy constituted on the basis of the polar relationships of these classes to the means of production, either as owner or non-owners of the latter. In capitalist societies, for instance, the two fundamental classes are the bourgeoisie (capitalists)

and the proletariat (wage-laborers); the former, the dominant class, own the means of production and on this basis, appropriate the surplus value produced by the proletariat, the subordinate non-owning class. This model recognizes the existance of other classes or strata outside of the main conflict polarity, either in a formative stage (like the bourgeoisie and the proletariat under feudalism) or as dissappearing segments of other classes (like the petty-bourgeoisie--small property owners--in capitalist societies).

However, with respect to capitalism, the traditional Marxist analysis downplays or simply refuses to recognize the formation of new classes or strata, different from both the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, who might have interest and claims to power of their own and who might be antagonistic to the interests and claims to power of the former two classes. This has been the case of the treatment given to the so-called intelligentsia, a stratum which in modern societies is mostly comprised of university trained professionals, technocrats, managers and bureaucrats. Marxists tend to see this social stratum as situated between the fundamental capitalists classes (the bourgeoisie and the proletariat) and for the most part, as sharing the interests of the bourgeoisie and functioning as the latter's ideologues, administrators or

technicians, though at times, it could also--as suggested by Gramci in his conception of the "organic intellectuals"[28]--of the bourgeoisie or of the proletariat, the intelligentsia is seen as having no significant interests of its own, and much less, as having interests of its own which might clash with those of the bourgeoisie or of the working class. The view taken in this study is that while the intelligentsia in capitalist societies, including colonial ones like Puerto Rico, might have at some point or other acted as the "organic intellectuals" of either the bourgeoisie or the proletariat, and while they in fact may have originated in those societies from the bourgeois classes, they also have developed distinct interests of their own as a differentiated stratum; interests that reflect at least in part their own claims for elitist power and status in society and which may be to some degree or other in conflict with the interests of both the bourgeoisie and the working class.[29] In industrial and industrializing societies, the intelligentsia like the working class (in both its blue and white collar divisions) has become increasingly dependent on wage-labor or salaried work for its living, however despite this similarity with the working class, the intelligentsia tends to occupy higher positions in the division of labor, not merely in terms of higher incomes

and greater job security, but also in terms of having more control over their own work as well as a large degree of control either over its clients or over the blue and white collar workers below them in the job hierarchy. On the other hand, while in capitalist societies, the intelligentsia remains subordinate to the bourgeoisie (in terms both of the direct control of the latter over the means of production and over financial capital and, through these, of the indirect control or influence on the State apparatus), and may in fact accept such subordinate role, especially in the most affluent economies, given the high degree of authority and material rewards they might enjoy there; it can be seen nevertheless as pursuing its own aggrandizement of power and privilege even at the expense of those enjoyed by the bourgeoisie. One could further argue that the intelligentsia not only may contest the power and privilege of the bourgeoisie in capitalist society by pressing for reform within the system--ranging for instance, from the establishment of meritocratic criteria in the civil service to the establishment of a welfare state where government technocrats and bureaucrats might have a greater role in the regulation of the private economy--that would limit the hegemony of the bourgeoisie, or for revolutionary changes that would replace the latter by the former as the dominant class, as well as the

principle of property-ownership of capital by that of expert knowledge as the dominant class power legitimating principle in society.

In this respect, it is important to stress that traditionally the intelligentsia has grounded its claim to power and privilege on the basis of its possession of so-called expert technical or professional knowledge, a claim which while remaining subordinate to other class-power-legitimating claims (namely property ownership), has been commonly recognized by society as a legitimate form of elitist power and privilege. However, in modern societies --and this applies to 20th century Puerto Rico--this claim has gained increasing weight with the expansion of the public school systems and the growing centralization and technologization of the various spheres of social activity, including the State, the economy and the educational system. With these developments, it is relevant to say, not only has the attainment of upper level positions in the hierarchical division of labor become increasingly dependent on the possession of expert, technical or professional knowledge, but at the same time, the acquisition of this type of knowledge has become even more associated with the attainment of high levels of schooling or more specifically, with university or higher education. In fact, in Puerto Rico like in other modern societies,

universities and other institutions of higher learning have been accorded almost the exclusive monopoly as training and certifying agencies of that type of knowledge. In that capacity they have played a fundamental role in the formation and growth of the intelligentsia as a distinct and separate social stratum with its own claims to power and privilege. In Gouldner's words, higher education has become "the institutional basis for the mass production of the New Class of intelligentsia and intellectuals".[30]

On the other hand, it should be added, the growth of higher education, and more so, the expansion of public primary and secondary education--and again, this refers also to 20th century Puerto Rico--has greatly increased the number of jobs available for the intelligentsia, and this not only in the teaching and academic occupations, but also in the administrative and technical ones in the ever larger school bureaucracy. Of course, aside from these occupations in the school system, one must also consider the notable increase of administrative, technocratic, and professional positions in the expanding bureaucracies of other divisions of the State apparatus as well as those in the economy, the political party system and the communication media. In short, these modern developments have provided the intelligentsia a much greater and central role in the management and ideological

direction of society in its various political, economic and cultural spheres.

It could be argued that in capitalist societies those developments have been in part sponsored by the bourgeoisie and that ultimately they have been instrumental in securing the reproduction of capitalist relations and hence the direction of the bourgeoisie over all social classes including the intelligentsia. It could also be argued that the growth of the intelligentsia as a distinct and different stratum was to some extent sponsored by the bourgeoisie in its efforts to technologize and scientize the means of production and of administration, and accordingly, make them more efficient both profit wise and as instruments of labor control. However, this might have been, one may also argue, that the intelligentsia has been at the same time actively involved in sponsoring such developments in order to advance its own specific interests in aggrandizing its own power and material advantages.

In sum, orthodox Marxism's downplaying or disregard of the role of the intelligentsia as an elitist social stratum potentially proned to aggrandize ever more its power and privilege at the expense not only of the bourgeoisie but also of the working class majorities, is another crucial limitation of this theoretical perspective as a critique of social domination in its diverse forms. Indeed, as has

been argued by several authors, such theoretical blindness could well be a reflection of traditional Marxism's own elitist orientation as an ideology of a radical sector of the intelligentsia--the so-called "professional" Marxist revolutionaries, trained in the principles of "scientific" socialism--that while it presents itself as the representative of the interests of the proletariat, stresses nevertheless its role as leaders of a centralized and hierarchically organized "vanguard" party intent on winning State power for that elite, and through such State power, on collectivizing the means of production.[31] Far from being an emancipatory/democratic ideology, this turns Marxism into a legitimating ideology of a new form of domination, namely, State socialism, with a bureaucratic and technocratic intelligentsia as its dominant social class.

To end this Chapter, it is appropriate to review briefly the relationship of this dissertation to the available literature on the history of education in Puerto Rico. Though this study is much in debt to such literature, especially as a valuable source of information and data, there are crucial differences in approach and interpretation between the former and the latter. For the most part, such literature has focused on describing in detail the expansion of schooling in Puerto Rico in its various

levels, and in general this expansion has been conceptualized in a language very reminiscent of the functionalists' evolutionary progressivism discussed above. Accordingly, the expansion of schooling in the Island, whether under Spanish, North American, or local sponsorship, has been interpreted as significant instances of "progress" or "modernization" benefitting the whole insular society.[32] In varying degrees, this literature has given some consideration to the limitations placed by the colonial structure on the development of schooling as well as to the unequal character of the distribution of school access among different sectors of the population. But on the whole it has tended to overlook or minimize the power structures and conflicts which have been endemic to the colonial situation and its various forms of domination and stratification as well as the ways in which such hierarchies and conflicts have shaped and have been shaped by the expanding school system.

In addition, some of the works in this literature have tended to justify some of those forms of domination as "civilizing" or "modernizing" influences over the Island. Thus, for instance, in their historical accounts of schooling under Spain's colonial rule, both Coll y Toste and Cuesta Mendoza present a glowing if not inflated (at least in the latter case) picture not only of Spanish

educational accomplishments, but more broadly of the general "civilizing" influence of the Spanish colonial enterprise.[33] Indeed, in justifying Spanish colonialism, Cuesta Mendoza even uses the racist argument that the disappearance of the indigenous inhabitants and the diminution of the African population were due not so much to their conquest and subjugation by the Spaniards but to the fact that they were absorbed biologically by the physically superior and stronger white colonists who frequently intermarried with them.[34]

Interestingly, the works of both Coll y Toste and Cuesta Mendoza were written in great measure as a response to the negative descriptions of Spanish educational efforts in Puerto Rico which appeared in various reports and documents written by North American officials and observers after the U.S. occupied the Island in 1898.[35] For the most part, these accounts presented a very bleak picture of those efforts and contrasted such bleakness with a glowing description of U.S. colonial educational efforts. Cuesta Mendoza's work was also, incidentally, a response to a first edition of Osuna's A History of Education in Puerto Rico[36] which the former considered to be highly unfair to Spain in its description and assessment of Spanish educational accomplishments on the Island. As it turned out, in revising the section on education during Spain's colonial

regime in the second edition of his history, Osuna acknowledged his indebtedness to Cuesta Mendoza, giving accordingly some credence to the latter's criticism. Nonetheless, Osuna's work, which to this day remains the best historical overview of schooling in Puerto Rico since the beginnings of Spanish colonialism up to the 1940s, comes out essentially as an account documenting, on the one hand, Spain's failures in establishing even a rudimentary school system on the Island in almost 400 years of colonial rule, and, on the other, the enormous achievements of the U.S. in establishing a modern system of mass schooling in just 50 years of colonial rule, an account which as far as it goes is fairly accurate.

It should be said that while Osuna expressed much admiration for U.S. institutions, he also criticized to some degree U.S. colonial rule and educational policies in Puerto Rico, even though such criticism was not as strong and unambiguous as the ones which could be and have been leveleed in this respect. As an admirer of U.S. liberal democratic traditions he favored the liquidation of the Island's colonial status and the granting to it of self-determination as an incorporated territory of the U.S. Regarding education, he favored the establishment of a public school system "embracing American ideals of education", yet with these ideals adapted to the "local needs"

of the insular "Latin American civilization", and in the hands of local appointees responsible primarily to the people of Puerto Rico rather than to the President of the U.S. Along these lines, though he favored in principle the use of schools as "Americanizing" agencies or the emphasis in the teaching of English in public schools, he criticized nevertheless the specific policies pursued in these respect by the colonial Commissioner of Education for being highly out of touch with local cultural conditions.

To some extent then, one can find in Osuna's works a consideration of the limiting effects of Puerto Rico's colonial situation on its school development as well as a liberal democratic critique of that situation. However, not only does such a consideration and critique remain weak and incomplete--for instance, in not examining the ways in which schooling served to legitimate and enhance the authority of the colonial State apparatus (or, as in the case of Spanish rule, of the Church apparatus) over the insular population--but also there is very little if anything in Osuna about the relationship of the school system to the socio-economic order, especially to its hierarchical division of labor, the forms of labor control and class domination and conflict which have been characteristic of the insular society under both Spanish and U.S. rule. On the other hand, there is in Osuna a

tendency to treat other forms of social hierarchization as natural or neutral phenomena and not as expressions of diverse forms of social domination: this is for instance the case in the references he made to sex-gender differentiation in schooling, or in his discussion about the centralization of the school system that was undertaken by U.S. colonial officials since the turn of this century. In short, while there is in Osuna a partial liberal democratic critique of the colonial political and educational policies and accomplishments, not only does this critique remains limited but his work ultimately fails to consider the socio-historical relationships of the school system to a variety of important structures of power and stratification in Puerto Rico--e.g. patriarchy, racism, capitalism and bureaucracy--which have profoundly limited its liberal democratic developments.

Two other works are worth considering in this brief literature review. The first is Negrón de Montilla's study documenting the "Americanization" policies and efforts of U.S. colonial authorities between 1900 and 1930.[37] This is the most important work on the topic written thus far, and it has been a very valuable reference in the writings of Chapters IV and V of this dissertation. However, some important limitations in Negrón de Montilla's study should be pointed out. In the first place, her study fails to

give sufficient attention to the conflicting positions regarding the "Americanization" policies and efforts that were taken at one time or another by different groups of the population. And in particular, it fails to take into account the strong support given to these colonial policies and efforts by the working class organizations of the Island. Accordingly, Negrón de Montilla's work not only presents an incomplete account of the social conflicts generated by the "Americanization" process undertaken by U.S. colonial authorities, but it also tends to be rather misleading in conceiving this process as being imposed on the Islanders without some degree of popular support.

Another, though related limitation of her work is that in documenting the "Americanization" policies she focuses almost exclusively on the political and cultural aspects of those policies and hardly touches on their socio-economic aspects, particularly on those features of the "Americanization" process referring to the adaptation of the insular school system to the new colonial, capitalist and bureaucratic division of labor that was bein sponsored by the U.S. colonial government. But to point out this limitation is not the same as saying, as Picó de Hernández suggests,[38] that in focusing on the political and cultural aspects of "Americanization", Negrón de Montilla gave too much importance to the most obvious and less significant

features of U.S. educational policies on the Island, while leaving untouched what Picó de Hernańdez considers to be the most important motivating factors of such policies, that is, the economic interest of the U.S. in Puerto Rico. This criticism, however, goes too far for even though it is true that Negrón de Montilla fails to consider the role of socio-economic factors in shaping educational policies during the first three decades of U.S. rule, there is also no question, as shall be seen in Chapters IV and V, that the interests of the colonial government in securing the political and cultural subordination of the Island's people played also a central, if not the most important, role in the formulation and implementation of those educational "Americanization" policies.

Picó de Hernández, by the way, is also the author of the best historical study on university education in Puerto Rico, covering specifically the 1930-1948 period.[39] In this work she provides an excellent analysis of the power relationships that shaped the development of higher education and the character of university student activism during that period, an analysis that takes into account the conflicts between U.S. colonial authorities and capitalist interests, on the one hand, and on the other, the various local social groups, as well as the conflicts among the latter groups. Perhaps the most valuable

contribution of Picó de Hernández's study is its examination of the central role that university education played in providing the children of the landed bourgeois and urban petit bourgeois classes--that were being displaced from political and economic power by the North American colonial government and absentee agro-corporations--the training for the expanding occupations of the increasingly commercialized and bureaucratized social hierarchy, positions that ensured the local elite some degree of power and privilege, though certainly still as subordinates, if not the intermediaries of U.S. colonial authorities and corporations. In other words her study provides a very illuminating account of the formation, distinctive interests and political trajectory of the university-trained professional and intellectual sectors, a social stratum which as noted before, may have been in large part the descendants of the local bourgeoisie and the petit bourgeoisie but whose claims to leadership, influence and privilege in the political, economic and cultural spheres of the Island were based more on the possession of university credededentials than on the property-ownership of capital.

Having noted Picó de Hernández's contribution to the understanding of educational and political developments during the first half of this century, it should be said nonetheless that her interpretation of these developments

differ at least in one important respect from the interpretation offered in this dissertation, a difference stemming in part from her tendency to adhere at times to an orthodox economistic Marxist framework of analysis. Like in her previously mentioned critique of Negrón de Montilla's work, Picó de Hernández's position in her study is that the primary motivating factors behind the educational efforts of the colonial government during this period were fundamentally economic in character; in other words, for her the colonial authorities were primarily interested in adapting the insular school system to the exigencies of the U.S. controlled agricultural capitalist development of Puerto Rico, and while she recognizes that there was also a concern in securing through the school system political and cultural domination, this concern was, according to her, not only secondary to the interests in securing economic hegemony but also instrumental in ensuring such domination. Again, as was suggested above and will be shown in Chapters IV and V, it is simply incorrect to argue that in the educational efforts of the colonial government in Puerto Rico during the first three decades of this century, the concerns of the latter in political and cultural domination were secondary in importance to the concerns in adapting the school system to the exigencies of the emerging U.S. controlled capitalist economy. If anything, such efforts, conceived as an essential component of the "Americanization"

efforts, were of a broad nature and were directed to make Puerto Ricans not merely productive workers respectful of their capitalist bosses, but more generally, American citizens loyal to U.S. political, economic and cultural institutions.

Ultimately, Picó de Hernández does not give sufficient attention to the possibility that the State apparatus, even in its colonial form like in the case of Puerto Rico, may well be, as has been argued previously, a separate and relatively autonomous sphere of domination in capitalist societies, with its own and distinct principles of legitimation and operation, and its own and distinct political, economic and cultural interests; and this irrespective of how closely intertwined it might be with capitalist relationships of domination in the economic sphere or how functional it might be in the latter's reproduction. Moreover, by failing to consider the relative autonomy of the State or the colonial government, Picó de Hernández also fails to give adequate attention to the latter as an expanding source not merely for schooled white collar workers, but also to university-trained professionals, administrators and technocrats, a situation which incidentally has been characteristic of increasingly centralized and bureaucratized State apparatuses (and again this has been the case also of colonial Puerto Rico during the 20th

century). In this situation, moreover, the latter sectors, that is, the professionals, administrators and technocrats may find in their positions in the social hierarchy of the State or colonial apparatus a significant amount of power and privilege with some measure of independence from the imperatives and interests of the capitalist economy, positions thus which might facilitate at times the emergence in these occupational sectors of ideologies and political orientations that might conflict in some degree or other with those of the capitalist sectors. Indeed, it might be argued that in Puerto Rico such a situation emerged to a considerable extent during the 1930s and early 1940s, with the extension of the New Deal to the Island and the foundation in 1938 and subsequent triumph of the Popular Democratic Party (PPD), developments which provided the opportunity for the rise in influence and leadership in the PPD-led populist and reformist movement of the period, of some sectors of the intellectual, technocratic and professional stratum. Again, Picó de Hernández's otherwise excellent treatment of the role of the intelligentsia and professionals in this movement is weakened by her inadequate consideration of the colonial apparatus as a central and relatively autonomous locus of power and privilege in the Island.

But, of course, any further discussion of this

reformist movement falls beyond the limits of this historical study which surveys educational developments only up to 1930. At any rate, having already outlined the basic assumptions of the socio-historical perspective guiding this dissertation, and having completed the examination of the available literature on the subject, it is appropriate now to glance back four centuries, and proceed with the survey proper at the beginning of the Spanish colonization.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Particularly, from Bookchin (1980, 1982), Castoriadis (1977), Giddens (1976,1979), Gintis (1980), Habermas (1970, 1971, 1974, 1975, 1979), Horkheimer (1972), and Unger (1976).

[2]For diverse, but critical and inspiring conceptions of the emancipatory ideal of personal autonomy and participatory democracy, see: Bachrach (1967), Bobbio (1978), Bookchin (1982), Castoriadis (1980), Gintis (1980), Habermas (1975, 1979), Lukes (1973), Macpherson (1977), and Pateman (1970). Useful suggestions of forms of education based on such emancipatory ideal can be found, for instance, in Bowles and Gintis (1977), Freire (1970), Goodman (1966, 1970), Illich (1971), Mendel and Vogt (1975), Neill (1960), Piaget (1976), Quintero Alfaro (1972), Reimer (1971), and Spring (1975).

[3]For important illustrations of this concern, see in addition to the writings listed in Footnote 1 the following: Bernstein (1977), Bourdieu and Passeron (1977), Bowles and Gintis (1977), Collins (1975, 1977, 1979), Karabel and Halsey (1977), Weber in Gerth and Mills (1958), and Williams (1965, 1977, 1981).

[4]This is, of course, a restatement of Marx (1965:15)'s classical formulation: "Men make their own history, but they do not make it under circumstances chosen by themselves, but under circumstances directly encountered, given and transmitted from the past."

[5]See Giddens (1976:110-113, 1979:88-94).

[6]Giddens (1979:93).

[7]Giddens (1976:112, 1979:93).

[8]The term "ideology" is used in this study to refer to any mode of discourse or system of ideas, beliefs or values, whether religious, philosophical, political, educational, scientific or the like, or a combination of these. It should be noted that to use this term in this general, "neutral" sense does not mean that it cannot be qualified: one could speak accordingly of legitimating ideologies of

domination and, hence, of racist, patriarchal, capitalist or colonial ideologies. For a useful discussion of the history of the concept of ideology, see Lichtheim (1967) and Williams (1977). For alternative conceptions of this concept, see Althusser (1977), Geertz (1977), Giddens (1979), and Gouldner (1982a). The conception followed here is closer to that discussed by Williams (1977).

[9]See Collins (1975).

[10]Understood in this study as the identity of the members of a social group, an identity based on their real or putative ancestry defined in terms of their common phenotypical features--generally on the color of their skin, culture, language, religion, nationality, or the like, or any combination of these. SeeSchermerhorn (1978:12).

[11]On patriarchy or male domination, see, for example, the readings in Eisenstein (1979) and Reitner (1979).

[12]Colonialism, racism and ethnic domination could be seen as variants of ethnic or ethno-national hierarchiza-tion. See in this respect Schermerhorn (1978) and Wallerstein (1979).

[13]On capitalist domination, see among others, Bowles and Gintis (1977), Edwards et al (1972), and Wallerstein (1979).

[14]Bureaucracy and technocracy could be seen as variants of meritocracy. Meritocracy legitimates positions of power and privilege in society on the basis of the imputed intelligence, technical skills and education of individuals. Bureaucracy refers specifically to a form of administrative organization in which positions are hierarchized and allocated to individuals on the basis, supposedly, of their technical training or credentialled expertise for the job. Technocracy refers to any form of organization or institu-tion where technical experts or the technical intel-ligentsia hold the main positions of power and privilege, a situation which could tend to be the case in modern, thoroughly "technologized" or "scientized" bureaucracies. On meritocracy, see Young (1958) and the writings by Bell, Bowles and Gintis, and Halsey in Karabel and Halsey (1977). On bureaucracy, see Crozier (1964), Unger (1976), and Weber in Gerth and Mills (1958). On technocracy and, more generally, on the social power of the intelligentsia, see Collins (1979), Giddens (1975), Gouldner (1982a, 1982b), Konrad and Szelenyi (1979), and the writings in Walker (1979).

[15]On representative liberal democracy as a form of domination and, hence, as a limited form of democracy, see Bachrach (1967), Macpherson (1973, 1979), and Pateman (1970).

[16]For the notion of "principles of legitimation" see Konrad and Szelenyi (1979); see also Unger (1976) who uses the analogous notion "principles of social order".

[17]On this multidimensional conception of power relationships and stratification, see Collins (1975); also Albert and Hahnel (1978).

[18]See, for instance, Giddens (1975) and Wallerstein (1979).

[19]Giddens (1975:115).

[20]Giddens (1975) and Wallerstein (1979).

[21]See, for instance, Cipolla (1970), Cremin (1970), Curti (1978), and Lockridge (1974).

[22]See in particular Collins (1975, 1977, 1979); also, Bernstein (1977), Bourdieu and Passeron (1977), Bowles and Gintis (1977), Karabel and Halsey (1977), and Nasaw (1979).

[23]Representative works are Durkheim (1956, 1961, 1964) and Parsons (1951, 1966). For critiques of this perspective, see Collins (1975), Giddens (1976), Gouldner (1971), and the introduction in Karabel and Halsey (1977).

[24]This economic reductionism is evident even in such sophisticated and insightful contemporary Marxist analyses of schooling as those of Bowles and Gintis (1977) and Baudelot and Establet (1975). For important critiques of Marxism's economic reductionism from a non-Marxist perspective, see Castoriadis (1977), Collins (1975), and Sahlins (1976); and from a Neo-Marxist perspective, see Albert and Hahnel (1978), Gintis (1980), Habermas (1970, 1971, 1974, 1975, 1979), and Williams (1977).

[25]For example, Althusser (1977).

[26]See, for instance, Althusser (1977), Bowles and Gintis (1977), and Baudelot and Establet (1975).

[27]For an excellent summary and critique of the classical Marxist position on social classes, see Giddens (1975).

[28]Gramci (1957:110-125).

[29]This formulation owes much to Gouldner (1981b), Konrad and Szelenyi (1979), and the writings by Albert and Hahnel, Ehrenreich, and Wright in Walker (1979).

[30]Gouldner (1982b:3).

[31]See, for instance, Gouldner (1982b) and Konrad and Szelenyi (1979).

[32]This is the case, for instance, of the general surveys of Puerto Rican educational history; namely: Coll y Toste (1910), Cuesta Mendoza (1937, 1946, 1948), Gómez Tejera and Cruz López (1970), and Osuna (1949).

[33]Coll y Toste (1910), Cuesta Mendoza (1937, 1946, 1948).

[34]Cuesta Mendoza (1937:6-7,37). Coll y Toste's racist and ethnocentric views are evident in (1910:4-8), but more so in (1907). For a critique of such views in Puerto Rican historiography, see Sued Badillo (1978).

[35]See, for instance, Carroll (1899) and V.S. Clark's report in U.S. Senate (1901).

[36]Osuna (1949); the first edition was published in 1923.

[37]Negrón de Montilla (1970).

[38]Picó de Hernández (1971).

[39]Picó de Hernández (1971).

C H A P T E R I I

SCHOOLING UNDER SPANISH RULE: FROM THE BEGINNINGS OF COLONIZATION TO THE MIDDLE OF THE 18TH CENTURY

Background of the Spanish Colonization of Puerto Rico

The Spanish colonization of Puerto Rico in the 16th century was part of a truly vast process of European empire-making as well as of nation-state formation.[1] By the middle of that century Spain had already created a vast colonial empire in the Americas and had extended its political domain over large portions of the European continent. This enormous expansion followed very closely the famous Reconquista, that is, the prolongued armed struggle (from 711 to 1492) by which the Christian kingdoms of the Iberian peninsula gradually reconquered the territories occupied by the Moors, culminating in the partial unification of Spain under the Catholic Kings in the later part of the 15th century and the fall of Moslem Granada in 1492, the year, significantly enough, of Columbus's "discovery" of the New World. To a great extent, the subsequent overseas conquests and colonization were a continuation of the expansionist thrust of the Reconquista and the transplantation to the New World territories of the medieval institutions

forged in that prolonged struggle.

The thrust of the Reconquista, like the subsequent overseas expansion, came from widespread sectors of the Hispanic population: the pressure of a rising population (especially in the Kingdom of Castile) for resettlement and colonization; a generalized individualistic drive for the acquisition of lands, wealth and glory; a strong collective religious zeal which gave the Reconquista the tone of a Holy War, and the interests of monarchs and militarized lords in aggrandizing their respective royal or feudal powers.[2] For the most part of its prolonged duration the Reconquista was characterized by the fragmented character of the Christian forces led by increasingly powerful but independent monarchs, and a militarized and adventurous high nobility, each presiding over territories with different dialects and legal political systems, and each with their independent armies staffed by a similarly militarized and adventurous lower nobility. At the base, the Reconquista was carried by a diversified poor peasantry and by rising urban lower and middle classes (e.g. artisans, merchants, notaries-scribes), who had obtained personal and collective feudal concessions in terms both of communal property rights (over woodland and pasture) and municipal self-government, from kings and lords who needed their popular support in the military struggles against

the Moors or to fight each other as the monarchies increased their hegemonic position over the nobility. Those local concessions and privileges found expression in medieval institutions highly representative and democratic for their time, such as the famous "fueros" (charters or statutes), the "cortes" (assemblies frequently summoned by the kings in order to obtain subsidies and which aside from the nobility and clergy represented also occasionally the rising urban commercial and artisan classes), and the relative self governing and democratic municipal councils (the cabildos or ayuntamientos).[3] Eventually, these institutions lost increasingly their democratic and autonomous character as Spain became more unified under a growingly centralized and absolutist monarchy; but as formal institutions they remained a constant focus of conflict in Spanish politics, both in the peninsula and its colonies, and served as major sources of inspiration for the intense liberal democratic and national liberation struggles of the 19th century.

Counteracting these pluralistic and regional factors as well as the individualistic drive for land, riches and glory, which tended to fragment the Iberian people, there were two additional expansionist forces which served as fundamental unifying agents. First, there was the Catholic Church and the militant clergy, itself forged

by the prolonged struggle of the Reconquista, playing the crucially important role of providing and articulating the crusading religious spirit that united ideologically the fragmented Christian political-military forces in their fight against the "infidel" Moors. Second, there were the dominant Christian kingdoms seeking to extend their power and imposing their political military hegemony in the struggle as well as over the other Christian kingdoms and principalities. Since the 13th century, particularly since the famous reigns of Ferdinand III and Alfonso X El Sabio (The Learned), the kingdom of Castile, with its stronger monarchy and military, its prosperous pastoral and commercial economy, its denser population and its flourishing cultural centers--especially the University of Salamanca, which ranked with Paris, Bologna and Oxford as one of the most important universities of the time, and the School of Translators of Toledo, a major agency not only in making the Castilian language the dominant and most vital vernacular literature in the Spanish peninsula but also in providing the rest of Europe with the translations of important Greek, Roman, and Oriental philosophical and scientific works--assumed the leadership of the Reconquista and of the struggle for Spanish unification. The political unity of Spain was consolidated by the powerful Catholic Kings (1479-1516), whose marriage

in 1469 united the kingdoms of Castile and Aragon (with its Mediterranean-Italian possessions) and under whose rule and leadership the Spaniards completed the Reconquista--with the conquest of Granada in 1492--and initiated their vast European and American imperial expansion. While basically maintaining a pluralistic policy of respecting the legal-political systems of the various Hispanic kingdoms and principalities, the Catholic Kings asserted the hegemony or sovereignty of their joint monarchy--centered in Castile, which not only continued to increase its political, military and economic hegemony on the peninsula but also gained increasingly a corresponding cultural-linguistic predominance--over all other Spanish institutions, laying the foundations of a strong and modern nation-state and of Europe's first modern imperial power.

The Catholic Kings reformed and expanded the royal--subsequently imperial--bureaucracy and military, strengthening the administrative and coercive power of the united monarchy while at the same time incorporating part of the higher nobility into the higher posts of the administrative and military hierarchy, and providing in such expanded apparatuses a large system of individual advancement for many members of the lower nobility (the so-called "hidalgos" and "segundones"), the rising bourgeosie, and for even a few members of the lower urban classes

and of the peasantry. Interestingly, the expansion of the royal hegemony together with the parallel expansion of the power of the Spanish Catholic Church were the major factors in the impressive growth and expansion during this and the subsequent period of the Spanish universities which served as major recruiting and training agencies for the higher positions of both the State's and the Church's hierarchies. Incidentally, the Catholic Kings were also great patronizers of the expansion of those higher learning institutions of which more will be said shortly. In other respects, they also fostered the development of a national market and of Spain's export trade (basically by protecting the powerful guild of sheepherder and wool producers, as well as by extending privileges to wool merchants in the export trade) and, with this, of Spain's merchant marine and naval power. They also were able to gain much authority over the temporal affairs of the Spanish Catholic Church; but while this restricted the power of the papacy over the Church in Spain the Crown was nevertheless a major force in the Catholic unification and homogenization of the Hispanic peninsula in launching the evangelization of America, and in allowing the Church to grow ever richer and to assume greater ideological leadership in their domains.

In pursuing their policy of religious unification,

the Catholic Kings continued and reinforced a trend toward religious exclusivism and intolerance which characterized the Spanish people and their Reconquista since the 14th century (until that century and particularly during the 13th century the Christian kingdoms were characterized by much tolerance for the large Moor and Jewish minorities) and which led to the mass forced conversion of these minorities and to their exclusion from public and ecclesiastical offices through legal statutes demanding "limipieza de sangre" (purity of blood), that is, proof of being pure "old Christians" ("cristianos viejos"), without trace of Jewish, Moor or African blood. It should be noted by way of passing that this popular trend toward religious (and social) exclusivism was closely mixed with the strong ethnically oriented economic grievances of many poor or impoverished Spaniards against, on the one hand, the converted Jews who constituted an important segment of Spain's financial and intellectual elite, and on the other the converted Moors ("moriscos"), who were a vital industrious sector of the artisan and peasant classes.[4] In any event following this trend in their policy of religious unification, The Catholic Kings first established in 1478 the Inquisition, the infamous repressive royal-ecclesiastical mechanism dedicated to stamp out heretics and heresies and which during their

reign was used primarily at the suspect Jewish converts; in 1492--the same year of the capture of Granada from the Moors and of Columbus's "discovery"--they expelled in mass the Jews from Spain; in 1499 they initiated a campaign of conversion against the Moors in Granada, and in 1502 they expelled the non-converted Moors from the domain of Castile. This religious exclusivism was to be also a fundamental driving force of the great imperial successor of the Catholic Kings during the 16th century, Charles I (1516-1556), and Philip II (1556-1598), the first continued the repressive and exclusivist measures against converted Jews and Moors, while the second, not only repressed all forms of Protestantism on the peninsula, but also led Spain into the vanguard of the Catholic offensive against the advance of the equally intolerant and exclusivist Protestant forces in Northwestern Europe.

The same religious fervor which permeated the activities of the Spanish Crown since the Catholic Kings--in fact, since the Reconquista--also permeated the whole Spanish colonial enterprise in America, as can be seen most noticeably in the direct and active support of the Spanish Crown to the Church's efforts of evangelizing the indigenous Americans and in protecting the colonists from heretical influences. But in all of these royal and imperial measures it is important to remember that

while the Crown was driven by a sincere religious fervor it was building at the same time, with the ideological support of an otherwise increasingly nationalized Church, a religious, cultural and politically unified nation and overseas colonial empire, Catholic as well as Hispanic, and loyal to the central Spanish monarchy. Nevertheless, while becoming increasingly subordinated to the Crown, the Catholic Church, and especially its Castilian hierarchy not only became wealthier with the Reconquista and the colonial enterprise but also increased considerably its already dominant position in intellectual and ideological matters, a position nurtured particularly by the missionary character of the Reconquista, the colonial expansion and Spain's European struggles. In such a position and together with the Crown, the clergy played a fundamental leading role in making Spain throughout the 16th century and the first half of the 17th century, one of Europe's most important cultural centers, being the leading ideological force of Spain's Golden Age (Siglo de Oro) in literature and the arts and the vanguard of the European Catholic Counter-Reformation against the Protestant forces. Incidentally it has been suggested with some justification that to call this movement a counter reformation is rather misleading, for in spite of its religious absolutism and intolerance--a

characteristic also of the Protestant forces--it was nonetheless characterized by much internal renewal and reform.[5] During the period that just preceded the Counter-Reformation, basically the reign of the Catholic Kings and Charles I (1479-1556), Spain had been greatly influenced by the Italian Renaissance and Erasmian humanism, influences which were however assimilated in forms compatible with Catholic orthodoxy. The Counter-Reformation--the beginning of which was marked by the famous Council of Trent (1545-1563), while its most important secular leader was the Spanish monarch, Philip II (1556-1598)--represented in a sense the closing of Spain to European influence as the former confronted the Protestant advances as well as the reaffirmation of the medieval scholasticism of the Catholic Church. Nevertheless it did so through an original renewal and elaboration of scholasticism--mainly scholastic theology, philosophy and law-which incorporated much of the political and social problematic of the humanist Renaissance.[6]

Significantly enough, among the principal centers for both currents of intellectual renewal and to a great extent of the whole cultural flourishment of the Siglo de Oro were the institutions of higher learning, which with the patronage of the Crown and the Church grew considerably in number, size and prestige, especially

since the reign of the Catholic Kings and up to the beginning of the 17th century. Thus to the 6 universities that Spain already had in 1474, 27 more were added in the course of this period, without counting the number of universities which, as shall be seen later, were organized in Spanish America during this time. This growth made Spain one of the most, if not the most university-educated societies in Europe at the time.[7] Of these, the most important and celebrated were the Universities of Salamanca and Alcalá de Henares, which were to have great influence--especially the former--on many universities established in Spanish America. The peninsular universities and particularly the latter two, were in large measure training institutions for the legal administrative officials--commonly known as "letrados", literally men of letters--staffing the higher positions of the Church and State bureaucracy, including the colonial and ecclesiastical hierarchies of Spanish America.[8]

It is interesting to note that the leading religious orders of the Catholic reform movement, the Dominicans and Jesuits, were to be not only among the most important evangelizing and educational agents of the colonial enterprise but also among the most energetic defenders of the "human rights" of the America's indigenous population. Moreover, while the Jesuits did not come to Puerto Rico

until the middle of the 19th century it should be pointed out that this religious order was to provide the Catholic world from the second half of the 16th century to well into the 18th century, with one of the most comprehensive school systems (basically colleges and universities) and programs of instruction (formulated by the Jesuits in their famous "ratio studiorum") which Europe as well as America had ever had, a school system renowned for its high academic quality, its rigorous and authoritarian discipline, its modern but orthodox Catholic scholasticism, and in time, for its elitist orientation.[9] In Spanish America, on the other hand, the Jesuits, besides being the major promoter of collegial and university education, were also renowned for their Indian missions, which, like their famous one in Paraguay, were characterized by their highly authoritarian and theocratic, though paternalistic and non-exploitative agrarian communalism.[10] In both the missionary and educational activities the Jesuits continued the works of other Catholic orders, like the already mentioned Dominicans and Franciscans. It was these two orders along with the secular bishopric, the only ones that were to do evangelizing and educational work in Puerto Rico up to the 19th century, a work which for reasons that will be discussed later was far less extensive and effective in Puerto Rico than in most of the rest of

Spanish America.

Apart from the missionary impulse of the Church and its orders, of the Spanish people as a whole, and of the Crown; and apart from the previously mentioned widespread impulses for individual glory and adventure, one must include among the many factors for Spain's expansion the own interests of the dominant monarchies in aggrandizing their power with the conquest of new lands and sources of wealth, as well as the interests of the even more important merchant and financial groups of the flourishing port cities of Castile, particularly of the Genoese and non-Castilian Mediterranean merchants and bankers who had established themselves there, in searching and securing non-Mediterranean and non-Portuguese overseas sources of precious metals and species (for the Mediterranean routes were increasingly threatened by the advancing Turkish empire while Portugal had taken the European lead, with their navigation and conquests down the African coasts, in securing non-Mediterranean sources of these valued commodities). Overall it should be pointed out that though the Spanish Crown maintained direct or indirect control over all the explorations, conquests, colonization and trade with overseas empires and though it received a large part of the income generated by the exploitation of the colonies, (officially a fifth of such income,

that is, "el quinto real") the initiative for such expansionist ventures was mostly in the hands of private entrepreneurs seeking to make quick fortunes: most notably the Genoese and non-Castilian merchants and bankers just mentioned who were the major financiers and navigators, and the famous "Conquistadores" (conquerors) and "adelantados" (military governors of the new territories), largely coming from the impoverished Castilian lower nobility, (hidalgos and segundones) who led the exploratory, conquering and colonizing expeditions with privately financed groups of Castilian soldiers, settlers--both groups largely ex-peasants--and priests.

The Colonization: Puerto Rico within the Emerging Mercantile World-Economy

The conquest of Puerto Rico, like the rest of Spanish America was the work of a few Spaniards who quickly dominated with their suprise military tactics, their superior weapons, their powerful drive for quick fortune and honor, and their strong missionary zeal, the immensely greater number of native inhabitants, including those of the advanced civilizations of the Aztecs of Mexico and the Incas of the Andes. In less than 50 years, Spain had established most of its extensive empire in the Americas, an accomplishment certainly disastrous

in many ways for the American Indians conquered, but nevertheless one that provided vast riches and lucrative positions for various sectors of the Spanish society: for the Spanish Crown, the merchants and bankers who financed the overseas ventures and controlled the transatlantic trade, the Catholic Church which received their tithes from the colonial treasures, the nobility and "letrados" who filled the positions of the large colonial bureaucracy, and of course the conquistadores and colonists. But it should be borne in mind that despite the immense riches made at the expense of the American Indians--and of the Africans forcefully transplanted there to replace the disappearing natives in the mines and the sugar fields--relatively little of the enormous flow of American treasures to Spain stayed there. Increasingly, much of it flowed out of Spain to other European centers either as payment for the growing number of foreign imports (both agricultural and industrial) on which Spain became increasingly dependent--in large measure because of Spain's failure to protect its own agriculture and industries, and to invest its colonial riches in their development while at the same time engaging in the mass repression and later mass expulsion of productive artisan and agricultural groups like the Moriscos and in protecting on the other hand, the rich, non-productive but luxury expending

sectors, like the landed aristocracy and the Church--or as payment for the huge debts contracted by the Spanish Crown with foreign European banks in order to finance its expanding imperial bureaucracy and its expensive imperial wars in Europe. Even at the height of maximum flow of American gold and silver to the metropolis, that is, between 1550 and 1610, the Spanish empire was already showing signs of exhaustion and decline, anticipating with the several bankruptcies of the Crown, the defeat of the Spanish Armada by the English in 1588, and the 1597 secession of Holland, its drastic collapse in 17th century as Europe's hegemonic political, military and economic imperial power.[11]

One of the major ironies of the Spanish empire and particularly of its overseas colonial enterprise, was that by creating a world market and by providing Europe with an abundant supply of gold and silver (hence the basis for cheap and secure metallic money) it played a decisive role in the emergence and establishment of a mercantile capitalist world system and, on this basis, in the development of Western Europe's capitalist agriculture and industry, a development, however, in which Spain lagged and which together with the decadence of the imperial State, left her in a considerably weakened (if not subordinate) economic and political position

relative to the strong emerging capitalist nation-states of Holland, England and France.

It is in reference to the above that one may say that despite the dominant feudal or non-capitalist character of the Spanish and colonial societies, from the beginning of the colonial enterprise the latter constituted an integral and important part of the emerging world-capitalist system, being exploited for the benefit not only of Spain monarchic, feudal and mercantile interests; but also, and to an increasing degree as Spain declined in imperial and economic power, of the increasingly stronger Dutch, English and French nation-states and their mercantile interests. Interestingly, since the 16th century and especially during the 17th and 18th centuries, the Dutch, English and French were not only gradually subordinating Spain in Europe in an economic sense but also gradually challenging her colonial power in America, first by plundering the Spain treasure fleets crossing the Caribbean in route for Spain, and then by taking over the lesser Antilles and a few of the Greater Antilles--for example, during this perriod, Jamaica was taken by the British, and the western part of the Hispaniola (Haiti) by the French; while there were some unsuccessful attacks to take over Puerto Rico and Cuba--and by establishing with the remaining Spain Caribbean islands, including Puerto Rico, and the rest

of the Spanish American colonies, a flourishing contraband trade that would further weaken the Spanish State and its economy.[12] Thus through Spain, and increasingly in spite of Spain, its American colonies were gradually incorporated and subjected as subordinate regions of a developing mercantile capitalist world economy growingly dominated by the northwestern European nation-states, even though their economy, (as well as their policy and culture), were under the direct-albeit weakened, political-military control of the Spanish State.

As subordinate regions of this developing mercantile capitalist world-economy, Spanish colonial societies were transformed into specialized export economies producing for a European dominated world-market and subjected to the cyclical demands and political-military disruptions of such a market. During the first phase of this process, while Spain was still the hegemonic European power, the main interest of the Spaniards was the exploitation of the precious metals of the conquered territories, and in such endeavors they exploited through forced labor the native inhabitants of those areas. As this source of cheap and forced labor quickly disappeared in Puerto Rico and the other Greater Antilles (which had been the first American territories conquered by Spain), the Spaniards began to replace them with

African slave labor. Soon, however, as the gold supply of these islands was depleted--in Puerto Rico, by the 1530s--the Spaniards attempted to turn these into sugar plantation economies producing for the European market, and worked by African slaves. But while during the rest of the 16th century there was some extension in the production and export of sugar, the major concern of the Spaniards was still the acquisition of precious metals, which since the 1520s was abundantly produced in its new colonies in mainland America, notably Mexico and later Peru. On the other hand, while Spain's economic interest in the Greater Antilles decreased considerably, the growing penetretion of the Caribbean by the Dutch, English and French, made those islands' military strategic importance for Spain, even more evident. Thus, gradually these colonies, particularly Cuba and Puerto Rico, were turned into important fuelling stations and military bastions guarding the fleets carrying gold and silver from mainland America to Spain. At the same time, as Spain plunged more deeply into its political, economic and military decline, a process which worsened with the long world economic depression of the 17th century and the weakening European and colonial wars into Which Spain was constantly drawn during this period. In these circumtances, the European demand for precious metals declined,

and Spain was left with little capacity to provide the transport, capital and cheap labor force necessary for expanding or even maintaining the production of sugar in the Greater Antilles, a staple whose demand otherwise continued to increase in Europe. Neither could Spain supply its colonists, through its trade monopolies, with basic commodities highly demanded by them, and those few which it did provide, including black slave labor, was done at a very high price. Under such circumstances European oriented large-scale production for export diminished considerably in Spanish America, but rather than a total paralysis of economic activities these circumstances led to their substantial reorientation toward an emphasis more on smaller scale production for regional markets relatively independent of the Spanish or European markets.[13] During this period, indeed, trade between the Hispanic colonies, especially among the continental ones of North, Central and South America a trade which had been prohibited by Spain, grew steadily in importance, and so did the contraband trade between the Spanish colonies, particularly those of the Caribbean, including Puerto Rico, and Dutch, English and French traders from the English colonies in North America.[14] Thus as shall be elaborated below, one finds in Puerto Rico that even though the primary activity of the overwhelming majority of the population

during the 17th and 18th centuries was of a self-subsistence character, and even though little local markets and internal trade developed, a growing number of the islanders became involved and profited from the flourishing illegal trade which was the main impetus during this period for the small scale but steadily growing external production of the Island.

The Colonization: The Fate of the Taínos of Boriquén

Before going too far into the 17th and 18th centuries it is important to look back briefly at the insular society which was trumatically inserted into the expanding Spanish empire and the European dominated economic order. When the Spaniards initiated the colonization and settlement of Puerto Rico in 1508--fifteen years after Columbus first reached its shores--the Island, like the neighboring ones of Hispaniola (today Haiti and the Dominican Republic) and Cuba, was inhabited by the Arawak Taínos.[15] Estimates of their population in Puerto Rico at the time of the conquest have ranged from a few thousands to 600,000, but the more reliable estimates set the figure at between 50,000 and 100,000.[16] The Taínos had a self-sufficient and communal agricultural economy which allowed for some degree of handicraft production and barter exchange. Their communal organization and the

level of development of their productive forces in conjunction with the fertile lands which they communally owned, provided them a relatively easy life and permitted the elaboration of a complex ceremonial and religious practice as well as a complex, though hierarchically stratified socio-economic and political division of labor. Their society was male-dominated, but it allowed nevertheless considerable participation for women in the communal economic, political and religious activities. Their level of agriculture, socio-political and religious development suggests accordingly, the collective cultural accumulation of relatively rich and complex, albeit rudimentary body of organizational and agricultural knowledge and technical skills as well as of relatively elaborated ideological, normative and value systems. Nonetheless they had not developed a written language nor established specialized formal educational institutions to transmit their culture and/or to train their members for specific roles in the division of labor. Thus, the social learning of their historically accumulated skills, knowledge dispositions, in other words, the acquisition and transmission of culture was essentially an informal process realized both through direct practical performance of familial and productive roles and tasks, and through direct participation in communal and religious

ceremonies and practices. In this respect it might be assumed that such informal process of transmitting (and developing) culture was hierarchical and stratified as it was embodied in the hierarchical and stratified structure and division of labor of the familial, productive and communal spheres in which the Taínos lived and raised their children.

By the 1530s, that is, only a few decades after the arrival of the Spanish colonizers in Puerto Rico, its Taino inhabitants had been practically decimated. The major factor for this demographic catastrophe, like that which befell the Indian population in all parts of Hispanic America, was the epidemic diseases introduced by the conquerors and for which the former had no natural immunities. But other factors connected to the conquest and colonization also contibuted to the sharp decline of the number of Tainos, including among these the deaths resulting from the cruel and exploitative labor to which they were subjected by the Spaniards, or from their uprisings against the colonizers (the major one occurring in 1511), or their emigration to the neighboring islands.[17] Even though after the middle of the 16th century a few Taínos remained in Puerto Rico--mostly those who fled into the interior highlands of the Island--and even though many aspects of their genetical-physical features survived

over the centuries in the insular population given the great number of Spaniards who sexually mixed with or married Taino women during the first decades of the colonization; and,further, even though a few of their agricultural and culinary practices, house types and words were incorporated by the subsequent insular inhabitants, the Tainos ceased to have any significant effect in the later demographic and socio-historical development of Puerto Rico.

Though generally brutal and exploitative of the Taínos and the other American Indians they conquered and colonized, it was certainly not the intention of the Spaniards to decimate their population. Economically most Spaniards were primarily interested in exploiting the precious metal riches of the colonies and to do so they needed a large supply of cheap labor. Initially this was of course potentially available in great quantity in the form of Indian labor but to secure and exploit it the Spaniards had to employ force, and slavery was indeed the first form of Indian labor used. Previous to the colonization of Puerto Rico, the Indians of the Hispaniola had been taken and exploited as slaves for the work in the gold mines, but the Crown and the Church, while generally recognizing the importance of forcing the Indian to work, objected vigorously to their slavery and to their extreme exploitation on the grounds that the

new Spanish subjects were in principle "free vassals" of the Castilian Crown who moreover were capable of becoming Christians. The Crown saw itself indeed as protector of the physical and spiritual well being of the American Indians and, furthermore, by virtue of the body of rights and articles obtained from the papacy known as "Patronato Real", by which the Crown assumed substantial control over most aspects of the Catholic Church, particularly of the Church in Spanish America, the Crown took as its supreme obligation the responsibility of Christianizing the "pagan" American natives. But in the treatment of the Indians the Crown found itself torn between conflicting interests, first, between its own need of securing a cheap labor supply for the production of precious metals and the desire to protect the natives from exploitation and destruction; and second , between on the one side the colonies threatening violence and rebellion if they were deprived of their major source of cheap labor, and on the other, an articulate group of jurists and clerics (including among the latter some Dominican fiars, most notably Antonio de Montesinos, who was to head the first Catholic convent of Puerto Rico, and the celebrated Bartolomé de las Casas). who condemned energetically the colonists for their treatment of the Indians and vigorously opposed any

form of enslavement or forced labor of the latter.[18] Under these conflicting pressures, the Crown followed a vacillating course which in effect legitimated the forced labor and forced Christianization of the American natives while seeking in vain to protect them from the cruel treatment and extreme exploitation of the colonists. In 1500 the enslavement of Indians was in principle forbidden, but exception was made specifically of the Carib Indians who during the 16th century, frequently attacked the Spanish settlements in Puerto Rico, as well as of any other Indians taken in wars or rebellions, exceptions which opened a wide door to abuse particularly of the natives of the neighboring islands of the Lesser Antilles. On the other hand, through a series of royal orders enacted between 1503 and 1513 the Crown legitimated the encomienda system, a regiment of forced labor imposed upon the so-called "free Indians", even though these orders were intended to regulate the encomienda and the general treatment of the native so as to protect them and to secure their Christianization and Hispanization. According to the encomienda and the rules which regulated it, Indians retained in principle their freedom and the property of their lands and other possessions, but they were legally obliged to reside in communities near the Spanish settlements (usually located close to the precious metal

mines), where they were assigned to particular Spaniards (usually the conquistadores or their descendents) known as "encomenderos", who in turn were authorized to demand tribute or labor from the former in return for which the encomenderos were legally obliged to protect the person and property of their assigned Indians and to provide them with Christian instruction.[19] It is particularly interesting that the first colonial orders regarding instruction, and specifically the teaching of the elements of reading and writing of the Spanish language in America, were directed primarily not for the instruction of the Spaniards but for that of the Indians. But of greater significance than this, was the fact that such instruction was conceived as part of a set of regulations designed to legitimate, albeit their alleged protective and humane intensions, not only the forced Christianization and Hispanization of the conquered indigenous populations, but also their forced labor and exploitation as embodied in the encomienda system.[20]

Having this in mind, it is worth looking into some of the most important educational dispositions provided by those regulations. The first appeared in the royal orders of March of 1503 to the governor of the Hispaniola, ordering among other things that Indians were to be gathered in "pueblos" (villages) to facilitate both their en-

comienda work and their instruction; accordingly a temple, a house and a missionary priest were to be provided in each pueblo so that Indian children could be taught reading and writing together with religious doctrine.[21] These orders were more or less reiterated between 1509 and 1511 to the first conquistadores and lieutenant governors of Puerto Rico (Juan Ponce de León and Juan Cerón).[22] More detailed were the royal orders of 1512 and 1513, known respectively as the Laws of Burgos and the Laws of Valladolid, the second directly applying to Puerto Rico and issued in response to the campaign of protest initiated in 1511 by the Dominican friars against the encomienda system. These laws by the way came also two years after the suppression by the Spaniards of the major rebellion of the Puerto Rican Tainos against Spanish rule. Interestingly, along with maintaining in force the encomienda system and with other measures attempting to protect and secure the religious instruction of Indians, these laws ordered every Spaniard with 40 or more encomendado Indians, to teach one of them reading and writing aside from the catechism; moreover, the Franciscan friars were ordered to take for four years all the 13 year old sons of the Indian chiefs and robles and teach them reading, writing and religious doctrine, preparing them accordingly as missionaries and teachers of Hispanic culture, Catholicism and royal loyalism

among their own people.[23]

However, if in subsequent years measures like these were to result in some actual intense efforts in Hispanizing, christianzing, teaching literacy and even various trades to the indigenous population of the Spanish colonies in continental America,[24] they were nevertheless not only ineffective in Puerto Rico and the rest of the Caribbean Antilles, but rather irrelevant, given that by the time these meassures were enacted the Indian population of these Islands had already been greatly decimated. It is interesting if not strikingly ironic that even long after this demographic catastrophe, the Crown and Church continued to enact orders for their protection, instruction and Christianization: thus, for example, among the dispositions of the 1645 Diocesan Synod of the insular bishopric, there was one ordering every local priest to establish public schools of primary letters for the children of the insular Indian population.[25] As a matter of fact by this time there were still a few Indians remaining in the Island, but no documentary evidence has been found regarding the establishment of schools for them, and all the circumstancial evidence tends to show that none was established. On the other hand it is worth advancing in this respect that since early in the colonization, especially after the depletion of the gold resources, and well into the 19th century all

religious and educational efforts of the clergy in Puerto Rico--that is, their work not only with the Indians but with the general population, including the Spanish colonists and their descendents--were to be severely limited by their constant shortage of personnel, the material poverty of the Church and its orders, and by the rural dispersion and isolation of the vast majority of the insular population.

For the moment it should be noted that whatever the extent of the missionary and educational work of the clergy in the various Spanish colonies, and despite the protective and humane intentions of most of the royal and ecclesiastical legal measure regarding the treatment of Indians, it is well known that these measures along with many of the other Spanish laws governing all of the Spanish colonies--known collectively as the Laws of the Indies--were often disregarded by the colonists, and that accordingly, Indians in most parts of Spanish America continued to be harshly treated and exploited.[26] And this even after the formal abolition by the Crown in 1542 of both the encomienda system and any form of Indian enslavement. Incidentially this new legislation not only came late to Puerto Rico and the other Antilles, where very few Indians remained, but was in fact revoked in the rest of Spanish America as the colonists there resisted to

the point of rebellion the abolition of the ecomienda.[27]

Black Slaves, the Contraband Trade and the Subsistence Economy

It is one of the most well known ironies that the same defenders of the rights and freedoms of the American Indians, including the principal and most energetic among them, Bartolomé de las Casas, were to advocate the use of African slaves as the forced, cheap labor substitutes for the former.[28] In any case, it soon became increasingly clear for the Spanish colonists, particularly those in the Caribbean region that African slaves could be a profitable replacement for the rapidly disappearing Indian population. Already before this happened a few black slaves had been brought to Puerto Rico to labor chiefly in domestic work. But with the massive disappearance of the natives of the Caribbean already evident during the 1510s, the Spanish Crown began to authorize the importation of large numbers of African slaves into the region mainly in order to substitute the former in the mining of gold and the construction of towns, and also, as the gold resources were being depleted, in the hard labor of the few and small sugar plantations which gradually became the main commercial enterprises of the Spaniards in the region.

During the 1520s the number of blacks greatly increased in the Spanish Caribbean, and by 1530 there were 1,523 black slaves in Puerto Rico, a number which though small for the size of the Island, already exceeded the number of Indians which were enslaved (675) or encomendados (473) as well as the number of white Spaniards (only around 600) on the Island.[29] More blacks slaves were brought to Puerto Rico during the rest of the 16th century as a result of the modest growth of the sugar plantation economy and the expansion in the works of construction and fortification in San Juan (the capital city), during and after that period. However, it should be noted that the number of African slaves in Puerto Rico not only increased very slowly during the 16th and 17th centuries, but as shown in Table I, it did so at a slower pace than the free population whose number, otherwise, grew very slowly and sparsely during that period; furthermore, as the population of the Island grew relatively more rapidly during the first half of the 18th century, the number of slaves grew at a far slower pace than the free population. Thus, if by 1673 the number of slaves was 4,500, that is, around 45 percent of the total population, by 1765, while going up in absolute terms to 5,037, it had gone down in relative terms to about 11 percent of the total insular population (see Table I).

TABLE 1

Population by Color and Civil Status

For Puerto Rico, 1530-1899

YEAR	FREE POPULATION			SLAVES	TOTAL POPULATION
	Total	Whites	Nonwhites		
1530	600	N.A.	N.A.	1,500	2,100*
1580	1,250	N.A.	N.A.	2,950	4,200*
1673	6,000	N.A.	N.A.	4,500	10,500*
1765	39,846	N.A.	N.A.	5,037	44,883*
1775	62,218	30,709	31,909	7,592	70,210
1802	149,859	78,281	71,578	13,333	163,192
1812	165,468	85,662	79,806	17,536	183,014
1830	289,798	162,311	127,287	34,240	325,838
1846	391,874	216,083	175,791	51,265	443,139
1860	541,443	300,406	241,037	41,738	583,181
1899	953,243	589,426	363,817	**	953,243
1910	1,118,012	732,555	385,457	**	1,118,012
1920	1,299,809	948,709	351,100	**	1,299,809
1930	1,543,913	1,146,719	397,194	**	1,543,913

* Not including indigenous population
** Slavery abolished in 1873

Sources: U.S. War Department (1900a)
U.S. Bureau of the Census (1910-1940)
J.L. Vázquez (1968:7,11)

In understanding the small growth of the slave population in Puerto Rico and the other Spanish Greater Antilles, one must remember that while there was some Crown supported development of sugar production--that is, the activity which generated more demand for slave labor-- in these islands during the second half of the 16th century, Spain was more concerned at the time with the exploitation of the rich gold and silver deposits recently discovered in Mexico and Peru, moreover, it left the slave trade in the hands of private monopolies--or, in spite of itself, in the hands of smugglers who were in fact to absorb a large part of the slave trade--who charged high prices for the imported blacks. This situation worsened with the decline of the sugar plantations in the 17th century and the already noted general decline of Spain's political and economic power. Another factor which seems to have limited the growth in the number of slaves during the first half of the 16th century was the policy of the Spanish Crown of reducing the imbalance between large slave populations and small white ones--an imbalance clearly evident in Puerto Rico by 1530, as noted previously--in order to protect the colonists from possible devastating uprisings of the former, a possibility dramatically underscored by a series of damaging slave rebellions in the Hispaniola (1522), Puerto Rico (1527) and

Panama (1531).[30]

Two additional factors are worth mentioning not only because they helped to limit the growth in the number of slaves but also because they also contributed to the growth of the insular free non-white population. One is the large incidence of escaped slaves, the so-called "negros cimarrones", who fled to the interior inaccessible highlands and forests of the Island, and who constituted a major concern for Spanish authorities both in terms of aggravating the labor shortage of the colonists and in presenting to these (landholders and slaveholders) a major source of lawlessness and insecurity.[31] The other factor was the relative liberal policy of manumision of the Spanish Crown, which provided a variety of institutional means by which the slaves could obtain their freedom (e.g. through provision of their owner's wills, military service, or by buying their own freedom). An important aspect of this policy was the practice initiated during the second half of the 17th century and continued throughout the 18th century of granting sanctuary and freedom to the runaway slaves of the neighboring English, Dutch and French colonies who in arriving to Puerto Rico were willing to convert to Catholicism and to pledge allegiance to the Spanish King. As a result of this policy many fugitive slaves from those non-Spanish

colonies came and settled in Puerto Rico, aggravating the tensions in the Caribbean between Spain and its colonial rivals, but at the same time contributing in a significant manner to the increase in the insular population during the first half of the 18th century.

In effect, one of the most noteworthy characteristics of the growth of the insular population during the first two and a half centuries of Spanish rule was that while the general population increased very slowly and sparsely, the increase in the free non-white population not only far surpassed the number of slaves but also came to almost equalize that of the white inhabitants. The growth of the non-white free population relative to the white and to the slave one is already evident in the 1673 census of San Juan, the largest "city" of Puerto Rico, which shows that out of its total population of 1,791, 820 were white, 667 slaves and 304 free "pardos" (the term "pardos" was a racial category used by Spaniards in different senses, sometimes to refer to mixed racial groupings and sometimes to refer to all non-whites; in this case it was apparently used to refer to all free non-whites).[33] But it is more evident in the 1777 census which shows that out of a total insular population of 70,210, 46 percent were classified as whites, 34 percent as free "pardos" (in this case "pardos" seem to

refer to people of mixed ancestry, including mulattos, probably the largest number of people in this category, and perhaps also some mestizos and other "mixed" types), 7 percent as free blacks, 2 percent as Indians and 11 percent as black mulatto slaves.[34]

Apart from the growth in number of the free non-white population these 1777 census figures also reflect the high degree of interracial miscegenation in the Island, a characteristic phenomenon of the colonial history not only of Puerto Rico under Spain, but of most of the Spanish and Portuguese colonies, and which contrasted very sharply with the case of the English and Dutch colonies, where the white and American Indian population--were more racially segregated, and where male white colonists tended to have more misgivings of mixing sexually, or taking as mistresses or wives, Indian or black females.[35] Apparently this situation resulted in less racial tension and conflicts in the Spanish (or Portuguese) colonies, as compared to the situation in the English, Dutch or French Caribbean colonies, but this should not be taken as suggesting that racism, or oppression and discrimination based on racial differences, were absent in Puerto Rico or the other Spanish American colonies. Not only whites, especially upper class Spaniards, and "criollos" (or creoles, that is, persons of Spanish or European

ancestry born and raised in the "New World") discriminated and disdained as racially inferior, free blacks, mulattos and the so-called "zambos" (the latter, part black and part Indian, were not very common in Puerto Rico given the early rapid disappearance of the Taínos), but these were also legally defined as inferior castes, and as such, legally excluded from public office (though not from the militia), from the elite professions, from schools, the guilds, and from other prerogatives of the whites.[36] They were in fact considered inferior to the Indians, who even though as noted before, were generally maintained in a servile status, were legally considered equal to the whites and enjoyed a few of their social prerogatives. Slaves, on the other hand, whether blacks or mulattos, were maintained at the bottom of the social hierarchy, legally or otherwise. In comparison to the English, Dutch and French colonies, in Spanish America slave laws were somewhat more humane--the case, for example, of its relatively liberal manumision laws mentioned before--while slaves, according to many travelers, were better treated, a situation which may be largely accounted for, as in the case of Puerto Rico, by the fact that slaves there cost much more to replace than in the neighboring non-Spanish colonies.[37] However, slaves in Puerto Rico like elsewhere in Spanish America had to suffer among other things the

indignities of their legally defined status as a piece of property and as mere instruments of labor under the coercive, though regulated control of their owners; of their brutal transplantation from their lands of origin to the New World, of the destruction of their indigenous cultures and their forced acculturation into the lower level of the Catholic Hispanic culture (e.g. they had to receive, basic religious instruction, but were excluded from any form of school instruction) of the harsh and cruel punishments from their owners, whether in compliance or not with the official rules regulating the treatment of slaves.[38]

As noted above, the white population of Puerto Rico, mostly peninsular Spaniards or criollos of Spanish ancestry, constituted by 1777 with 31,951 inhabitants almost 46 percent of the population.[39] After the depletion of the gold resources in the 16th century many Spanish settlers left the Island--many moved to the Spanish American mainland apparently attracted by the gold and silver riches of Mexico and Peru--and subsequently until the 18th century as Puerto Rico remained economically valueless for Spain, few new Spaniards (or European) emigrates settled there. The white population thus, like the rest of the population, grew very slowly during the 16th and 17th centuries, and even though it grew, like

the non-white, at a faster rate during the first three quarters of the 18th century, the increase was still relatively small and the continued growth of whites and non-whites still left the Island, by 1777, sparsely populated.[40] Notwithstanding that the small insular elite was almost exclusively white (whether peninsular Spaniard or creole), the overwhelming majority of the white inhabitants, like the overwhelming majority of free non-whites, were poor small landholders or subsistence farmers, living anonymously, scattered, and isolated, if not as nomads, in the sparsely populated rural areas.[41] Many of these small farmers and subsistence peasants were the descendents of soldiers who had deserted the garrison in San Juan and of escaped or shipwrecked sailors and stowaways, some of which were non-Spaniards. Some of the legal white immigrants and some free non-whites became small landowners, but it seems that most of these, like most of the illegal ones lived and did their farming on the unattended and uncultivated lands of the Crown or of large landowners. Apparently, life and farming methods of these settlers were very rustic, but the fertile lands and the abundance of wild cattle and poultry in Puerto Rico allowed them a relatively easy self sufficient life. On the other hand, the flourishing contraband trade of the period gave many of them an outlet

to their principal surplus products--the products of activities which like the subsistence ones, required little labor, capital and productive skills--principally the hunting of wild cattle (then very abundant and mostly valued for their hides), cattle raising, the planting of ginger and, to a lesser extent, of tobacco; products which they exchanged, usually in barter trade with the foreign contrabandists, for flour, clothes, rum, knives and other articles. It should be noted in passing that though one of the major items of the contraband trade was slaves, these were bought mainly by the richer planters (mostly sugar producers) and cattle ranchers, who were also the owners or possessors of the larger estates ("haciendas" or "estancias"). Some subsistence farmers and small landowners also worked occasionally in these large landholdings as wage workers, and in time an increasing number of them, particularly those who were squatters in the large estates, became attached in a more dependent subordinate relationship to the latter's owners ("hacendados" or estancieros") either as peons, tenant farmers or sharecroppers. It seems, according to some reports, that during the late 18th century, these dependent peasants--known as "agregados"--became the major source of labor for the large, commercially oriented hacendados, surpassing in number the slave labor force.[42] However,

during the whole period covered by this Chapter, the hacendados had much difficulty in securing and exploiting the labor of small peasants and agregados mainly because these continued to have plenty of opportunities to escape the control of the former by settling as subsistence farmers in the abundantly fertile and inaccessible lands of the interior of the Island. It would not be until the 19th century, as shall be seen in the next Chapter, that the increasingly powerful hacendados were in a position to compel the small subsistence formers to work for them by enlisting in such an endeavor the coercive power of the colonial State apparatus. But before the second half of the 18th century, most of the subsistence farmers, isolated and dispersed in the countryside, had little contact with and were generally outside the influence of the few small towns and urban settlements which until then had been established in Puerto Rico, and this includes San Juan, the walled capital city and largest insular town. In other words, most of the rural population was largely outside of the control not only of the large hacendados but also of the colonial administrative, military and ecclesiastical authorities as well as of the merchants who had monopoly over the legal export-import trade of the Island.

It must be remembered that by 1765, San Juan, the

largest city, the seat of the civil-military and ecclesiastical governments, the commercial and cultural center, and the only official port of Puerto Rico, had only around 4,500 inhabitants while the few other towns and settlements of the Island had actually only a few rustic homes clustered around a rustic church, whose single priest was often the only resident figure of authority, as the handful of local landowners and hacendados who constituted their socio-economic elite, lived like the rest of the town neighbors (vecinos) mostly dispersed in the countryside.[43] Apart from San Juan, only another town, San Germán, the second in importance in the Island, had a municipal government--the so called "cabildo" of which more will be said later. Each town had since the end of the 17th century an urban militia composed of most of its male adult neighbors, and under the command of a civil-military deputy ("teniente de guerra") named by the governor, but the militias were highly undisciplined, poorly organized and hardly equipped, while the civil-military deputy scarcely reported to the governors.[44] In San Juan on the other hand, the presence of the colonial administrative, military and ecclesiastical offices was greatly evident and so was the presence of the socio-economic elite represented by the small export-import merchant sector and by the resident wealthy hacendados. It had,

moreover, a military garrison of around 400 soldiers, a growing though still small number of petty retail merchants municipal workers and artisans--the labor of the latter much demanded by the works of construction and fortification of San Juan--and around 950 slaves, many used as domestics by the wealthy families but many also employed in the works of construction and fortification.[45] It is worth remembering, in this context that this massive and costly work of fortification in San Juan--initiated in the 16th century and continued through the 18th century, and which had made Puerto Rico's capital, itself an island city, an impressive walled fortress--was the result of the growing military strategic importance of Puerto Rico for Spain and of the frequent threats and attacks to which the Island was subjected by the British, Dutch and the French who were aware of its strategic importance for the control of the Caribbean and the trade routes connecting Spanish America with Europe. Given however the previously mentioned state of the insular economy during this period, particularly the insignificant growth of its local markets and the stagnation of its legal export-import trade--which meant by the way, the commercial stagnation of San Juan, the only port in the Island through which such trade could legally take place then--coupled with the expanding and widespread contraband trade with the neighboring islands,

generated scarcely any legal revenues to sustain even a small civil-military-ecclesiastical colonial apparatus, not to say the costly fortification of San Juan. In the face of these circumstances, the Spanish Crown was forced to rely on revenues generated elsewhere, a reliance that from 1586 to 1811 took the form of the famous "situado Mexicano", which consisted of an annual subsidy paid to the colonial treasury of Puerto Rico by the royal treasury of Mexico. The "situado" became in effect the main, if not the only, source of revenue of the insular treasury during this period, and most of it went to finance the military garrison and works of fortification in San Juan as well as to support the small administrative, military and ecclesiastical hierarchy which was largely concentrated there. Little of this and other governmental revenues remained, however, to connect (e.g. through roads) San Juan to the interior of Puerto Rico, or to build the necessary civil, coercive and ideological apparatus necessary for maintaining effective control over the insular population beyond the walls of the city.[46] It was there, among the inhabitants of the walled city capital of San Juan, with its military garrison and its resident colonial hierarchy where the power of the Spanish Crown had its principal, if not only, weight, but even there, it should be pointed out, one finds over time the frequent participation of colonial

officials, including some of the insular governors in the flourishing contraband trade of the Island, violating thus flagrantly the mercantile exclusivist laws of the Crown.

The Spanish Colonial Apparatus

Interestingly, the ineffective and weakened position of the Spanish Crown over its colonial officials and over its colonists during the period covered in this Chapter, contrasted very sharply with the elaborate and complex character of the formal legal structure of the colonial apparatus. As suggested before, the authority of the Castilian monarch over Spain had become increasingly centralized and, in principle, absolutist vis-a-vis the Spanish people throughout the Reconquista, a centralized and absolutist authority which the King would nominally retain over the colonial territories and vis-a-vis colonists and colonized, also vis-a-vis the Church. The control of the Crown over the Church merits special attention in this study because it was to the latter and its orders to which the Spanish monarchs delegated the authority and responsibility over cultural and educational matters in the peninsula as well as the colonies. Indeed, even though the Spanish clergy exercised direct authority and responsibility over such matters, and even though

the Spanish monarchies were staunch Catholics, the former were under the Crown's firm control. In fact the control was firmer in Spanish America than in Spain, given the stipulation of the previously mentioned papal concessions known as the Patronato Real, according to which the Crown, in return for the obligation of providing for the building and sustenance of churches and missions in America, had the following important prerogatives over the Church's hierarchy: the power to appoint or authorize all ecclesiastical positions and to collect all tithes; the power to authorize the construction of all churches and monasteries; the right to fix or change the limits of dioceses; and the right known as "pase regio" which required the royal license--hence the royal approval--of any papal bull, brief or publication of a non-doctrinaire character circulating in the territories including any papal order authorizing the establishing of universities.[47] Thus the Patronato Real sealed tighter the relationships between the Spanish State and the Church, and while these relationships were not always nor totally harmonious, and while the Patronato institutionalized their mutual influence and support (e.g. the Church defending the divine right of Kings and the Crown championing Catholic orthodoxy) it nevertheless subordinated substantially the Church to the State in

important respects.

In 1524 the Crown vested the administration of the colonial empire in what was to become one of the most powerful royal councils of the Spanish government the "Consejo de las Indias" (Council of the Indies). Next to the monarch to whom it was effectively subordinated, the Consejo had the uppermost authority in all spheres of the colonial government, whether executive, legislative, judicial, military, ecclesiastical, commercial and, for a time, financial.[48] Two important instruments the Consejo used to exercise control over all important colonial officers--i.e. viceroys, governors, judges, town majors (alcaldes ordinarios)--were the "juicios de residencia" (judicial reviows) and "visitadores" (visiting inspector generals), the first arranged by the Consejo to review the officials' conduct at the end of his term, and the second, sent to the colonies from time to time by the Consejo to investigate any official. In its legislative capacity, the Consejo was responsible, along with the monarch, for creating over time the previously mentioned Leyes de Indias (Laws of the Indies), a voluminous and detailed body of legislation which touched on almost every aspect of the duties, rights and responsabilities of the colonial settlers and officials, and of the treatment of Indians and black slaves. This body of legislation re-

flected not merely the centralizing and imperial intentions of the Spanish Crown but also its deep and long enduring distrust and fear of the colonists and even of the ruling colonial officials, who in the distant and rich American territories could easily develop interests of their own as well as independent loyalties potentially in conflict with those of the Crown. In the course of time the Laws of the Indies proved to be too cumbersome and contradictory, and many of its precepts were often disregarded by both colonists and colonial officials--as in the cases mentioned before regarding the treatment of Indians or the contraband trade--but as a whole they served to formalize to an impressive degree the concentration and centralization of colonial power in the Spanish monarchy.[49]

The other major metropolitan agency administering colonial affairs for the Spanish Crown was the Casa de Contratación (House of Trade) in Seville. Subordinated to the Consejo de las Indias' authority, the Casa de Contratación was the chief colonial agency for the regulation and development of the mercantile trade between Spain and its colonies. It had exclusive authority in the licensing and supervising of all ships, merchants, migrants, goods and equipment going to or coming from the Americas; in collecting custom taxes from each trade and in receiving all the revenues sent by

colonial officials from the Americas.[50] As all trade with the colonies had to pass through the Casa de Contratación, it was confined in Spain to the city of Seville and its subsidiary neighboring port city of Cádiz, benefitting in particular the merchant houses of these cities and their import-export agents in the colonies which had practically a monopoly on the colonial trade. But most importantly, the Casa de Contratación was in charge of administering and supervising Spain's exclusivist mercantile policy, that is, of ensuring Spain's monopoly of all trade and shipping with its colonies and the appropriation of a substantial part of their wealth. Though this policy was, as noted previously, flagrantly violated by the colonists during the 17th and 18th centuries, and though during this period it contributed little in counteracting the decline of the power and economy of the Spanish State, it nevertheless provided a rigid and exploitative commercial framework for the colonies through which a large part of its riches were syphoned to Spain and through Spain to the other emerging European powers.

Throughout most of the period of Spanish rule in America, the most important governmental agents of the Crown in the colonial territories were the viceroys, captain-general governors and audiencias. The manner in which the Crown and its colonial council divided the

authorities between on the one hand the viceroys or captains-general, and on the other, the audiencias is also revealing of the great mistrust of the former over the colonial officials. As direct representatives of the King, the viceroys and the captains-general, were the chief civil and miliary officers in the colonial provinces, the viceroys exercising such authority over the largest political jurisdictions, the viceroyalties (which until the 18th century were basically two, one with the capital in Mexico, and the other in Peru), while the captains-general governors had similar authorities over smaller political jurisdictions, such was the case in Puerto Rico since 1582.[51]

As chief civil and military officials of their respective provinces, both viceroys and captain-general governors had not only the principal executive and police powers but also important legislative and judicial function, though in the latter role their decision could be appealed to the audiencias in their districts. Moreover, by virtue of the Patronato Real, and as delegates of the Crown, the viceroys and the captain-generals also exercised some degree of control over the clergy in their territories: for example, they were in charge of collecting and administering the ecclesiastical tithe, of nominating the parish clergy and lower ecclesiastical

officials (as noted before, by virtue of the Patronato Real the king nominated the higher clergy: bishops, archbishops and abbots), and authorized the establishment of churches, monasteries and church schools and hospitals.

The other principal agency of the Crown and its Council of the Indies in the colonial territories, the "Audiencias", were the highest royal courts of appeal.[52] Until 1800, the Audiencia which had jurisdiction over Puerto Rico was the one located in Santo Domingo, the capital city of the neighboring island of the Hispaniola.[53] As court of laws the Audiencias heard and decided appeals from the judicials decisions of the viceroys or captains-general, but apart from this function, the Audiencias could also check the powers of the former through its authority to review the acts of those governing officials. In such capacity, the Audiencias became one of the principal instruments of the settlers against the military powers of viceroys and governors. This was frequently the case in Puerto Rico, especially throughout the 16th century and during the early part of the 17th century as illustrated by the numerous interventions of the Audiencia de Santo Domingo in response to the complaints of the insular settlers against the local governors.[54]

All the judges ("oidores") of the Audiencias, the

viceroys, governors, and other high governmental, military and ecclesiastical officials in the Spanish colonies were appointed and removed by the Crown and its colonial council, and to the end of Spanish rule in America, including its last possessions Puerto Rico and Cuba, most of these officials were peninsula Spaniards. Thus, with few exceptions; even the white wealthy criollos were generally excluded from the higher positions of authority in the legal-administrative and military hierarchies, though not as much, it is worth noting, in the top ecclesiastical hierarchy nor, as shall be seen shortly, in the municipal governments.[55] The policy of exclusively appointing peninsula Spaniards to the higher legal-administrative and military posts, along with the practices of frequently moving those higher officials to other territories and of prohibiting them from having kinship and economic ties in the areas where they were appointed, responded in great measure to the previously mentioned fear of the Crown of losing the political loyalty of distant and independently minded colonial officials who could develop interests of their own. In addition, the policy of appointing peninsular Spaniards served apparently two other purposes for the Crown: on the one hand, it provided opportunities for employment and enrichment for Spaniards of all ranks who found themselves in a con-

tracting metropolitan economy; and on the other, it provided an immediate source of income for the Crown, since the lucrative positions of the colonial bureaucracy were usually sold since the second half of the 16th century.[56]

It is particularly interesting to note at this juncture that the policy of excluding the criollos from the positions of authority in the colonial and military hierarchy, in combination with other policies of the Crown which conflicted with the interests of the former--such as the exclusivist mercantile measure, or those regulating and abolishing the encomienda system, or as shall be seen below, those regarding land use and distribution--significantly contributed to the formation in Puerto Rico as elsewhere in Spanish America to a strong sense of differentiated collective territorial identity and antagonism between the criollos, especially the urban and elite landowning criollos, and the peninsular Spaniards. Indeed, the appearance and frequent use itself of the terms "criollos" (or alternately, "Americanos" and "indianos") and "peninsulares" (or alternately, "europeos" or "hombres de la otra banda"--i.e. "men of the other band") is clear evidence of such growing, conflictive, differentiation. In Puerto Rico, this regional identification appears to have been well developed already

by the 18th century, as shown for instance in the historical account of Abbad y Lasierra, first published in 1788.[57]

The lowest level of government in Puerto Rico, like elsewhere in the Spanish empire, was the municipal council or, as it was generally called in the colonies, the cabildo or ayuntamiento. The cabildo was the only governmental institution in which Puerto Rican or Spanish American criollos, particularly their affluent white land-owning sectors, were substantially represented. Though in medieval Spain, as noted earlier, the municipal councils had been fairly democratic and autonomous in character, by the time they were transplanted to the American continent they had already lost much of their autonomy to the king or to the governor and his deputies, and become deeply oligarchic in character. As mentioned before, by the middle of the 18th century there were in Puerto Rico only two cabildos, San Juan and San Germán, both established early in the 16th century, though the former on a firmer basis than the latter which had a nomadic existence till the second half of the 16th century. Until the beginning of the 19th century the Island was divided into two political jurisdictions (partidos), the western half under the cabildo of San Germán, and the eastern, under that of San Juan. Even though both cabildos were under the nominal authority of the insular governors and his deputies, such authority was stronger in San Juan which was also the

seat of the central government than in San Germán which was distant and hardly accessible to the former.[58]

At any rate even in the 18th century when the central government gained greater control over the towns outside of San Juan, the cabildos retained some important responsibilities. For example, they served as a court (civil and criminal) of first instance and it was the main agency of distributing land in the colony.[59] Authority in the cabildos was vested chiefly in two kinds of officers. The "regidores" (councilors) and the "alcaldes ordinarios" (mayors or magistrates), but in time other municipal officials, largely deputies of or appointees by the governors, were attached to the cabildo either as voting or non-voting members. The regidores were in charge of selecting the alcaldes ordinarios (there were one of two of these officials in the cabildo, depending on the size of the town), but the regidores themselves, rather than being elected by the town neighbors like in medieval Spain, were for the most part either appointed by the Crown, or nominated by the governors (or as earlier during the colonization, designated by the original conquistadores or adelantados), or chosen by the outgoing regidores subject to the approval of the governor.[60] Regidores, moreover, were often designated for life, a

practice which was continued after the second half of the 16th century when the office of regidor and other municipal posts, like many offices in the Spanish State bureaucracy, began to be sold by the virtually bankrupt Crown. Since then most municipal offices (except that of alcaldes ordinarios which continued to be elected by the regidores became for all practical purposes pieces of hereditary private property.[61] This practice and the cabildo's authority in the distribution of lands contributed in making these municipal councils oligarchic bodies controlled almost exclusively by the wealthy and large landowning families in the municipal jurisdiction. In effect, it would be more appropriate to say that the cabildos were controlled by the white Catholic upper classes of the municipalities since to acquire municipal or State offices anywhere in Spain or its colonies, aspirants had to show their "limpieza de sangre" ("purity of blood"), that is, to show proof that they were whites and Catholics, "clean" in their blood of any non-white or non Christian race.[62] As local political institutions controlled by the white wealthy criollos, the cabildos were to serve as instruments not merely for reinforcing their oligarchic power at the expense of that of the lower classes and social strata--though in this juncture it should be remembered that even though they could use the cabildos

to increase their land grants, their effective control over the small farmers or landless laborers was, as mentioned before, limited, given the rural dispersion of these, and the availability of abundant lands--but also for articulating and defending their interests vis-a-vis the encroachments of the central colonial authorities. In this latter function, the cabildos, and in particular that of San Germán, which was more assertive of its autonomy given its distance from the central authorities in San Juan, played an important role in the frequent conflicts between the wealthy creole landholders and the colonial officials, conflicts arising at times over the clandestine trade but perhaps most frequently over the use and private ownership of lands--e.g. disputes mainly over the possession of public wood-lands and grazing lands and the distribution of unused and unopened royal lands ("tierras baldías y realengas").[63]

Schooling and the Catholic Church

If the effective legal-administrative and, even, military control of the Spanish Crown over the insular population remained generally weak throughout the first 250 years of colonial rule, so did the control of the Catholic Church which during this period--and in fact, during most of the rest of Spanish rule--functioned

largely, by virtue of the previously mentioned Patronato Real, as a subordinate branch of the Crown, and as such, as the latter's principal ideological and educational agency. As noted previously, the Church in Puerto Rico was characterized during most of this period by the shortage of clergy and its general poverty. It must be remembered in this respect that unlike the Church in many of the other Spanish colonies and especially unlike that of Mexico and Peru, the insular church had little private resources, lands or real estates and could collect only a small amount of the traditional tithe payments given the chronic, poor situation of the insular (legal) economy. Even the payments that the Church began to increasingly draw from the Mexican situado in the 18th century--a development that made it even more dependent on the State, which by virtue of the Patronato Real already administered the collection of the ecclesiastical tithe--allowed for very small growth of the Church resources or its clergy. The shortage of clergy is revealed very dramatically in the following figures for 1765, in which for a total insular population of 44,883 there were only 68 priests and friars in the Island, of whom 42 were concentrated in San Juan and just 26 in the rest of Puerto Rico.[64]

This was enough to limit significantly the Church's principal responsibilities, whether missionary, educa-

tional or simply ministerial. But this situation was made worse for the Church--as was the case also for the State--by the rural dispersion of the overwhelming majority of the insular population and conversely by the lack or small development of urban concentrations in the Island, conditions which made even more difficult for the few existing priests and friars to reach and influence the people and thus to ensure not only Catholic orthodoxy but also, as an agency of the State, the peoples' loyalty to the Crown.

It is appropriate to remember in this context that the Crown and its colonial bureaucracy were committed as much as the Church not just to ensuring the political and ideological loyalty of its subjects but also their Catholic orthodoxy and that despite of the weakness that also characterized them in terms of being able to enforce their policies, their coercive power was still strong enough for securing some aspects of their mutual religions and educational objectives. Of particular importance in this respect were the Crown's policies of controlling, on the one hand, the emigration to the colonies, and on the other, the shipment and printing of books there. Regarding the former, the Crown attempted through the Casa de Concentración to confine emigration to the colonies to persons both loyal to the Crown and of unquestioned orthodoxy,

while specifically barring the entrance of Moors, Jews and herectics condemned by the Inquisition as well as their descendents, and all Protestant foreigners.[65] Regarding books and printing, the Crown attempted through the various agencies of the Consejo de Indias, the Casa de Contratación and Inquisition, to impose censorship particularly on those books printed in or shipped to America which were suspected of being antimonarchical, heretical or Protestant.[66]

It is difficult to know to what extent were these measures effectively enforced in the colonies and specifically in Puerto Rico. On the whole it appears that notwithstanding the weakened position of both the State and the Church, most of the insular population remained during this period nominal Catholics and loyal to the Crown, in the latter case, at least, when it came to the defense of the colony in face of the attacks of Spain's European enemies. But this did not prevent the widespread disregard and non-compliance with many of the Crown's and Church's laws and orders, nor some degree of religious heterodoxy. Thus, one finds the growing involvement of wide sectors of the population in the contraband trade; moreover, one finds also the extensive incidence of concubinage among nominal Catholics, their frequent abstention from the Catholic mass and the Church

sacraments, and their frequent mixture of Catholic practices and beliefs with those of Indian or African origin or with those involving magic or spiritism.[67] With regard to the measures on migration to Puerto Rico it appears that the Crown and the Church were rather successful in preventing the entrance of Moors, Jews, Protestants and other non-Catholics though as mentioned before, a number of unlicensed Spaniards and foreigners entered the Island during this period as shipwrecked or escaped sailors and stowaways.[68] Regarding the censorship of books and printed material shipped to Puerto Rico, it should be first noted that on the whole the measures to this effect were laxly enforced and that many so-called heretical forbidden books entered the colonies through the extensive contraband trade, this being especially true during the 18th century with the writings of the French and English philosophers of the Enlightenment, and those relating to the U.S. Independence War and the French Revolution.[69] But in the case of Puerto Rico there appears to have been little importation not only of forbidden books but even of non-forbidden ones, whether through contraband or through lax officials, thus in a sense the censorship on important books was rather irrelevant on the Island.

More irrelevant, perhaps, was any order censuring the printing in Puerto Rico of unorthodox or politically

dangerous materials for not until the first decade of the 19th century--the precise date remains uncertain--was a printing press brought to the Island.[70] Indeed, despite of the fact of being one of the first colonies of the Spanish empire, Puerto Rico was one of the last to have a printing press; a fact which appears more striking if one considers that both Mexico and Peru had functioning printing presses during the 16th century (for that matter, even before the colonization by the British of eastern North America) and that most of the rest of Spanish America, including Cuba (1707-17024) and the Hispaniola (at the latest 1782, but perhaps much earlier) had at least one each by the 18th century. Thus, well into the 18th century there was in Puerto Rico practically no circulation or availability of books and printed material, whether imported from other parts or produced locally. This is of course very revealing not only of the Island but also of the little interest of most sectors of the population in learning how to read or write. It is also revealing of the little enthusiasm and efforts of both the Church and the State in creating a reading public, even for purposes of religious and political instruction and control. In this respect one must have in mind that apart from the absence of printing and of printed materials, there were several other factors in Puerto Rico which limited the

need of the insular population for learning to read and write. Thus, it is worth remembering that the urban concentrations were few and small; that a vast proportion of the Islanders were small subsistence farmers with little contact with the urban centers; that a great number of these farmers were squatters in the lands of the Crown or of large land-holders, and that even many of the latter did not have titles of ownership over their landholding; that there was little internal commerce and that the small though slowly expanding external trade was largely illicit and that such commerce, whether internal or external, was mostly characterized not by money exchanges but by face to face barter transactions; and that even in San Juan, the commercial and cultural center and the political, military and ecclesiastical capital, there was only a small amount of commercial, record keeping, legal administration and, as shall be seen shortly, educational activities, and thus little requirement or need for literacy.

Unfortunately, there are no official or reliable literacy statistics for Puerto Rico before the 18th century. In fact, there is on the whole little documentary evidence on educational institutions and efforts before the 19th century, but the area of literacy in particular remains thus far one of the most unresearched topics in Puerto Rican educational history. However, considering

the already described socio-economic and political conditions of the Island, and what shall be discussed below with respect to the educational situation, it is very plausible that by the middle of the 18th century the literacy rate of the whole insular population was not higher than 5 percent. In fact it appears that even in San Juan, where most if not all of the insular educational institutions were located, the literacy rate did not reach such a level. This assumptions needs of course to be better substantiated, though it tends to be supported by the rough estimates made by Adolfo de Hostos[72] of the "learned" population which for him was almost totally reduced to the governmental, municipal, military and ecclesiastical officials there and which according to his calculations amounted to only 1.3 percent of the approximate 4,500 inhabitants of the city. It could be that these estimates underestimate the number of literate people in San Juan, particularly by not including the merchants and artisans among whom perhaps there were some who knew how to read and/or write; but merchants and artisans were in any case only a handful of the population and it is very doubtful that they could have raised the literacy level above 5 percent. And if this was so in San Juan, the cultural, political and commercial center of Puerto Rico, one could easily suppose that literacy rates were

even lower for the rest of the Island.

It is worth putting these figures in comparative perspectives; and more specifically it is worth examining them in the light of the contemporary developments in literacy in Spain. First it should be noted that even though Spain and several of the Spanish American colonies had operating printing presses much earlier than in Puerto Rico--Spain as far back as 1473--; or that the circulation of books and printed material was much more abundant there; or that their educational efforts were more extensive, especially in the area of secondary and university education; or that on the whole their State, Church and economic institutions were more prosperous than those of the Island; that is, that even despite all of these, their gains in the spread of literacy appear to have been only slightly better than those in Puerto Rico. In Spain, for example, the literacy rate during the 18th century appears to have been no more than 10 to 15 percent,[73] striking figures if one compares them to those of other Western European countries and of some of the British colonies in North America. Thus, for instance, the male literacy rate seems to have been around 47 percent in France by 1799, 60 percent in England by 1754; 75 percent in Scotland by 1750; and 85 percent in New England by 1760.[74]

Also striking about Spain's figures is that they

represent a level of literacy which was probably reached as far back as the 16th century and which remained more or less stagnant during the following two centuries.[75] As suggested before, since the late 15th century and through the 16th century Spain had become one of the most university-educated societies in Europe, and it is very probable that its literacy rates were not much different from those of other European countries at the time. As in other European countries, the introduction of the printing press (in 1473), the spread of mass-produced books and pamphlets, and the influence of Renaissance humanists is Spain gave a strong stimulus not only to university education, whose language of instruction was mainly Latin--and so it was in the university-preparatory institutions known as grammar schools or colleges, which also grew in large numbers during this period--but also to instruction in the art of reading and writing in the vernacular. This stimulus, along with the expanding economy resulting from the imperial overseas expansion gave rise to an almost spontaneous growth in the number of private tutors and of private instructors--the latter known as "masters of primary letters"--as well as in the number of rudimentary public elementary schools supported by the revenues and rents of municipal councils and/or private individuals.[76] Soon however, the Crown and the Church began to regulate that

spontaneous growth especially as it became evident that the increased availability of books and pamphlets could also be the medium for the spread of heresies and subversive ideas. In fact, the Church and the Crown were so fearful of the spread of vernacular literacy and books that they went so far as to prohibit the reading of the vernacular Bible fearing that it would lead to heretical interpretations.[77] Moreover, while the Inquisition assumed a greater role in the censorship of unorthodox and subversive materials, a series of rules and regulation were handed down to ensure religious orthodoxy (which of course also meant at the time, political orthodoxy) in elementary instruction. Church dioceses, for example, began to order parish priests and sacristans to teach the three Rs and to appoint "visitors" to examine the "masters of the children's schools" for their religious orthodoxy.[78] At the same time, the Crown and the Church attempted to have also greater control over the "masters of primary letters" by establishing stricter licensing procedures to guard not merely against unskilled and incompetent teachers but also against heretical ones.[79]

There had been as far back as 1370 attemps by the Crown of Castile to intervene in the regulation of teachers of primary letters, but the new situation of the 16th century, with the spread of books, the threat of

humanist and Protestant heresies and the large growth in the number of such teachers, gave the Crown as well as the Church more reasons to increase their control over primary instruction and, hence, their regulation of primary instructors. Interestingly the spontaneous growth in the number of primary teachers also prompted the "masters of primary letters" to pressure for stricter licensing procedures of new teachers, presumably in order to ensure high instructional standards, but also in order to protect their own interests by limiting the number of licensed teachers and, hence, by limiting their competition. This was more successfully achieved by the "masters" of Madrid, who led a campaign in the 17th century along those lines and who with the help of the Crown organized themselves in 1666 into a confraternity--the Hermandad de San Casiano--that was empowered to set licensing procedures in all of Castile; subsequently the Hermandad was to, among other things, raise the standards required of new masters and limit the numbers of primary schools in Madrid.[80]

On the whole it appears that the attempts of the Hermandad, as well as more broadly, those of the Crown and the Church in regulating and controlling primary schools and teachers were more effective in restricting than stimulating the growth in primary instruction in the vernacular. It is important to note that apart from

its attempts in regulating private instructors, the Church and its orders were not as directly active in elementary education in the vernacular in Spain as they were in the teaching of Latin and in univerisy education. Little is known in Spain of the extent to which parish priests who were officially expected to teach the three Rs, actually did so. There was some basic instruction in vernacular literacy offered in the cathedral and monastic schools--the latter especially in the Jesuit and the Franciscan orders--institutions primarily specialized otherwise in Latin instruction and in the preparation of the clergy. Interestingly, one of the major efforts of the Church--especially again of its Jesuit and Franciscan orders--in literacy instruction was done in the context of their missionary work with the Indians of the Americas, an effort which, as has been discussed before, came too late to Puerto Rico. In Spain however, much of the impulse given to the expansion of primary education came apparently from the municipal councils and from private initiative rather than from the Church or, for that matter, the Crown.[81]

This leads to a brief consideration of an important point regarding the historical role of the Catholic Church and the Catholic monarchies in the expansion of literacy and primary education especially in comparison

to their Protestant counterparts. There is no doubt that the former, as exemplified by the Spanish Church and monarchs, was a major force in the extraordinary growth of the secondary schools and universities during the Renaissance and throughout the 16th century. But it is important to remember, as has been often suggested, that unlike Protestantism--and particularly the Puritan sects which dominated England (at least during the 17th century), Scotland and New England--Catholicism did not place much importance to vernacular literacy as part of its religious teaching, whether of its clergy, whose training was basically in Latin, or of the parishioners, whose religious socialization was based chiefly on imagery, rituals, oral liturgy and oral catechism.[82] One of the main exceptions to this was the efforts of the clergy in the teaching of Spanish literacy to the American Indians, but again this was done chiefly to aid their missionary work with a conquered people which was not only non-Hispanic but also linguistically heterogenous. As noted above, the Spanish Crown and Church went so far as to prohibit the reading of the vernacular Bible, perhaps the most striking evidence of their fear of the subversive and herectical potential of the creation of a wide reading public. By contrast Protestantism, otherwise as intensely concerned as Catholicism in ensuring

religious conformity and control in the regions where it was a dominant force, stressed on the other hand the reading of the vernacular Bible and of the writings of the Protestant Reformers as a moral imperative for all its parishioners, and hence made great efforts in achieving mass literacy--principally among its male population--through primary schools or instructors firmly under the ideological control of each Protestant group.[83]

As varying authors have suggested, these differences between Catholicism and Protestantism may explain to a large degree the much greater literacy rates and elementary school expansion during the 17th and 18th centuries in the regions dominated by the latter as compared to the former.[84] According, for example, to the estimates of Cipolla for the 17th century, the rate of adult literacy in Protestant Europe ranged from 35 to 45 percent, while in Catholic Europe from 15 to 20 percent.[85] But one must have in mind that other factors which cannot be completely explained in terms of the differences in religious impulse may had been at work there. In this respect one must remember that in general terms the Protestant regions were during this time politically stronger and economically more prosperous than the Catholic regions--perhaps the main exception among the latter was the increasingly powerful and rich and predominantly

Catholic France, a fact which may go a long way in explaining her roughly intermediate position between Protestant and Catholic countries in terms of literacy rates, though in this regard it should be pointed out that Protestantism was in fact a dominant force in precisely those regions of France which were more commercially and industrially developed in a capitalist sense.[86] This connection between Protestantism and the development of European capitalism is of course a very complex and problematic topic which cannot be examined in any detail in this study, but it should be enough to say that it points to the possible convergence of a diversity of historical factors (religious as well as economic and political) which might had contributed--perhaps with varying force--to the greater growth of primary schooling and literacy in Protestant countries than in Catholic ones.

If on the whole the expansion of primary schooling in Catholic Spain and its empire was quite limited, it was much more limited in Puerto Rico which as has been previously seen remained basically at the margin of the former's colonial plans. In his otherwise thorough 1765 report to the Spanish king on the state of the defense, resources and needs of Puerto Rico, Marshal Alejandro O'Reylly noted that there were only two schools for children on the whole Island, but he did not specify the

location of the schools, nor if these were public or private or whether they included the classes offered at the cathedral or the Dominican and Franciscan convents.[87] It has been suggested by Coll y Toste and Osuna that the schools mentioned by O'Reylly were only the public schools, and that he failed to report the private schools that according to them were in existence on the Island; but neither of them provides evidence for the existence of such kind of schooling aside of what was available in that regard in the cathedral and the convents.[88] It is certainly possible that while the instruction offereed in these Catholic establishments was, as shall be seen shortly, primarily in Latin and principally oriented educationally for the training of the clergy or as secondary preparatory institutions, they might had also offered lessons in Spanish literacy like they did in Spain, hence, that they might had operated in some sense as primary schools. Such possibility is emphsized by Cuesta Mendoza who affirms categorically, in questioning O'Reylly's estimates, that Spanish literacy was taught to children in the cathedral and the Dominican and Franciscan convents, aside from the two schools mentioned by the latter.[89] However, Cuesta Mendoza does not provide much evidence to support such affirmation aside from mentioning that a handful of Spanish grammar teachers were appointed to

the Franciscan convent, one in 1659 and seven others between 1761 and 1811.[90]

Indeed, the only other known references to actually established primary schools before the brief mention in O'Reylly's report were made by bishops Padilla (1654-1694) and Urtiaga (1712) in letters to the Crown: the first one informing of having established and endowed from his private revenues a public primary school in San Juan which however ran soon into trouble and apparently was forced to close given the extreme poverty of the students;[91] the second one reporting of having established in the countryside schools which however did not persist given their great distance from the students.[92] The other known references to primary schools or to instructors are mentioned within the context of decrees and orders of which no record is so far available about their actual implementation, if they were ever so, for it appears that like many other Spanish decrees and orders, these were barely implemented at all. Such was the case of the already mentioned Indian educational laws of the 16th century as well as of the orders of the Diocesan Synod of 1645 regarding the establishment of public primary schools for the insular indigenous population. The same Synod also required the examination, certification and inspection of teachers of primary

instruction,[93] but apart from the existance of the appointed teachers in the Franciscan convent, there is no documentary reference to any other primary school teacher before 1765--much less to any confraternity of masters of primary letters like the Spanish Hermandad de San Casiano--nor to any case of examination, certification or inspection by the Church, the government, the municipal councils or any other organization. It is of course possible that there were during this period some non recorded cases of private teachers or tutors, but this could have amounted to only a handful of these given the poverty, subsistence and disperse character of nearly all of the insular population.

In 1764, one year before O'Reylly's visit to Puerto Rico, the bishop of the Island, (Mariano Martí) ordered the establishment of elementary public schools for boys in two small towns--Bayamón and Guaynabo--in the neighborhood of San Juan. Trying to refute O'Reylly, Cuesta Mendoza argues that these schools were effectively established, thus adding to the ones reported by the former; in fact, Cuesta Mendoza goes on to speculate that the bishop went on to establish several other schools around the Island, but he fails to show any evidence regarding the actual establishment not only of these latter schools but also of the first two ordered by the bishop.[94]

In short, given the overall thoroughness of O'Reylly's in his 1765 report, it is very unlikely that he failed to notice the schools supposedly established by the bishop, and even if one adds to the two schools reported by O'Reylly,, the lessons of Spanish literacy that were offered--at least occasionally--in the Franciscan convent and perhaps also in the cathedral and Dominican convent, his school figures do not seem to be an exaggeration of the status of primary schools in Puerto Rico.

Though it is doubtful that the schools ordered by the bishop were ever established it is nonetheless worthwhile pointing out the reasons he considered them necessary. According to him these schools were to teach not only reading, writing and grammar but also Christian virtues and whatever was needed for a submissive and obedient civil and political life.[95] Interestingly these remarks were made at a time when the contraband trade was very widespread in Puerto Rico--this is indeed one of O'Reylly's major findings--and when the Church was struggling to have more control over the religiously lax and non-practicing Catholic population. In any event, this view of primary education as an instrument of religious and political control will become, as shall be seen in the next Chapter, more frequent and forceful after 1765.

Another possible source of primary instruction in the Island before this period might have been the system of apprenticeship of the craft or artisan guilds. Several artisan guilds, for example, of tailors, shoemakers, masons, carpenters, blacksmiths and silversmiths--were already in existence at least in San Juan by the first half of the 18th century (indeed it might be that some of these guilds were organized much earlier) all probably following the Spanish and more broadly, European medieval corporativist tradition of mutual help among its members--deriving in great measure from religious inspired fraternal organizations which in Spain were known as "cofradías"--and of restrictive and closed membership, secured by a rigid and graduated system of apprenticeship.[96] However, there is so far very little known information about the practices of such guilds before the 19th century (in fact, though more information is available about artisans and guilds in the 19th century, much still remains to be learned about them in that period too) thus not much is known of their apprenticeship training practices or more specifically of the extent to which these practices incorporated literacy instruction. At any rate artisans constitued only a very small minority of the population--for example in 1824, the earliest date for which statistics for them are available, they were es-

timated to constitute only 3.6 percent of the labor force--[97] and that not all of them were members of the guilds.

In connection to this, it is worth mentioning that probably blacks and mulattos constituted a growing proportion of the artisans groupings in Puerto Rico, though it is very likely that as non-whites they were generally excluded from the guilds in Puerto Rico before the 19th century, for in the guilds like in schools, public offices, the clergy and most high positions in Spain and Spanish America the racist exclusivist practice of "limpieza de sangre" (purity of blood) was commonly observed.[98] In short, it is very likely that the organized guilds had only limited control over artisans as a whole, and that if such was the case, even if one assumes that literacy was a component of the apprenticeship system, it may be that it was accessible to only a very small proportion of the artisan and working classes.

With respect to women, nothing is known of the extent to which they attended the very few primary schools that were established, nor of the extent to which the wealthier among them were instructed in primary letters by private teachers or tutors. The only known establishment for women was the convent of the cloistered nuns of the Carmelites founded in San Juan in 1649, but there is no

evidence regarding the offering of any literate education there. It is interesting to note that the cloistering of women in convents had become a very common practice in Spain and its colonies in the 18th century, especially among the unmarried women of the richer families, a practice which was part of a broader process of allegedly protecting women (unmarried or not) from the dangers of sin and which was accompanied by a greater emphasis in the importance of the Catholic marriage, the subjection of women to their fathers and husbands, and their isolation from public life, whether in the house, or if unable to marry, in cloistered convents.[99] The same process was characterized by the separation of the sexes in primary instruction, and hence, the organization of separate schools and classrooms for boys and girls--though certainly much fewer schools for girls than for boys--in which the convents became the most widespread means of formal education for girls. Puerto Rico seems to have also experienced such process of increasing subjection and surveillance of women, apparently with a stronger emphasis in San Juan and among the women of the upper classes. And though no separate school was set up for them until the end of the 18th century, they had of course their cloistered convent. But then it appears that their convent was more a place of quiet isolation and refuge

from the world than an institution of formal education. It should be noted incidentally that the establishment of the convent in San Juan was prompted by the problems posed to many of the elite families of the Island by the large number of their daughters who were left unmarried largely as a result of the substantial number of men who emigrated to more prosperous regions of the Spanish empire.[100] It appears accordingly that these families were more concerned with finding an accessible, safe and decorous place for their unmarried daughters where they could spend the rest of their lives, than in providing them any kind of formal education.

Like elsewhere in the Western world, women in Puerto Rico were excluded from any form of organized education beyond primary instruction, but one must remember that such education was at any rate accessible to only a very few men. Before 1765 the little education which could qualify as such by the standards of the time was that offered by the already mentioned cathedral church and the Dominican and Franciscan convents, the first two built in the 1520s and the last in the 1640s. Thus far the information available regarding the educational activities of these institutions remains very scanty and fragmentary. The little that is known suggests that their educational offerings were very rudimentary and

uneven not only in terms of the standards of the time in both Europe and America (including most of Spanish America) but also when compared with the Spanish and European cathedral and monastery schools of the medieval period from which they evolved. Thus, before looking more closely into what is known of their development in Puerto Rico, it is convenient to have a brief look at their medieval and contemporary counterparts.

The medieval cathedral and monastic schools were in large measure the institutions from which almost the entire European secondary and higher scholastic system evolved.[101] At first, the education in these schools was almost exclusively available for intending priests and monks and their curriculum was basically limited to the teaching of the rudiments of Latin grammar, the Psalms and choir plain-song. With the growth of the papacy and the Church bureaucracy in the later part of the Middle Ages, the cathedral and monastery schools grew in importance as agencies of ecclesiastical recruiting, and began to expand their curriculum, complementing the teaching of Psalm, plain-song and the rudiments of Latin with the classical "liberal arts" and occasionally with theology and canon law. The liberal arts were an inheritance from the Hellenistic period, comprising originally the so-called "trivium" of grammar, rhetoric and dia-

lectics, and the "quadrivium" of music, arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy, in time with the influence of the Aristotelian renaissance of the Middle Ages--facilitated in great measure by the efforts of the previously mentioned School of Translators of the Toledo of the Reconquista period, which provided Europe with translations of unknown works of Aristotle and the great scholastic synthesis of Aristotelian philosophy and Catholic doctrine made by Thomas Aquinas in the 13th century, philosophy (or more properly, the Aristoletian logic, ethics, metaphysics and physics) began to substitute the dialectics of the trivium and the whole quadrivirum. With these developments came a hierarchical specialization of medieval Latin education, in which most cathedral and monastic schools continued to teach basically Latin grammar and the rudiments of the liberal arts, while a few of them evolved into the universities or "studium generale",[102] having usually a lower faculty of liberal arts, and at least one of the higher faculties in theology, canon law, civil law or medicine. As such, the universities or "studium generale" became degree granting institutions, a distinction first obtained through custom on the basis of the enduring and widespread prestige of some of the universities (Paris, for example), but which later increasingly required the formal authorization of the Pope

or the emperor, or, like in Spain and particularly Spanish America on account of the Patronato Real, that of the monarch.[103] In their degree granting capacity, these institutions which certified the scholstic mastership of their graduate in the liberal arts or in one of the specialized higher academic disciplines of theology, law and medicine. Moreover, their degrees--namely the advance ones of licentiate and master, or what sometime was used interchangeably with master, doctor--licensed their holders not only as lawyers or physicians or as candidates for the upper legal-bureaucratic ranks of the Church and State but also, and primarily, as teachers of Latin grammar, the liberal arts or the higher university disciplines. On the other hand, the lower studies in Latin grammar and liberal arts, whether taught in the universities or in non-university institutions--such as the traditional cathedral and monastic schools, or in colleges and seminaries established since the Counter-Reformation by the bishops and the Jesuits--became the required preparatory instruction for the specialized studies of theology, law and medicine as well as for the advanced master studies in liberal arts.

In this connection it is important to remember that especially since the Renaissance Latin was studied not only as a preparatory training for university studies

but also as an end in itself, for even a rudimentary knowledge of it conferred a measure of status and prestige, the mark of the cultivated man, and gave access at least to the lower positions in the Church and the State.[104] Thus as a preparatory basis for the universities studies in theology and the liberal professions, Latin schooling became the object of widespread demand. Interestingly, this demand gave rise in Spain and in some other European countries to a fierce competition for a student clientele among the universities with lower faculties in Latin and liberal arts and non-university Latin and liberal art schools and colleges in which the latter, especially those managed by the Jesuits, were able to deprive the universities of much of their grammar and liberal art clientele.[105] Eventually, with their almost undistinguishable curriculum, it became a common practice for both the lower faculties of the universities and some of the non-university colleges (as well as some seminaries) to grant bachelor of arts degrees; however both retained their character of preparatory schools--the equivalent of the modern secondary schools--while the universities maintained their monopolies in the granting of the higher degrees (e.g. licentiate, master or doctorate) in liberal arts, theology, law and medicine.

In Spain, as noted before, university education

expanded greatly during the 16th century, largely in response to the growing demands for trained personnel of the militant and missionary Church and of the expanding imperial bureaucracy of the Spanish monarchy; however, the growth of the universities stagnated and declined during the 17th century, largely as a result of Spain's economic and political decline during that century, and also perhaps, because of the reduction in the demand for university trained legal-administrative officers (that is, the "letrados") which followed the intensification during that time of the Crown's practice of selling royal offices.[106] The decline of university education slowed down during the 18th century, as Spain recovered politically and economically under the Bourbons--of which more will be said in the next Chapter--but even this recovery, did little to raise university education from the depressed level which it reached in the previous century. Secondary education, that is, Latin education, had during the 16th and 17th centuries, a trajectory of rapid growth and stagnation similar to that of university education, but it had a much greater recovery than the latter during the 18th century until 1767, when the Jesuits, the major promoters of secondary education since the second half of the 16th century and who even during the period of educational and overall Spanish

stagnation during the 17th century had managed to sustain the high and modern educational quality and effectiveness--albeit its authoritarianism and religious orthodoxy--of their colleges were expelled by the Crown from all the Spanish territories.[107]

Regarding Spanish America it is worth noting that on the whole secondary and university education expanded there at a rate at least as impressive as that in Spain during the second half of the 16th century, and perhaps at a greater rate during the subsequent two centuries. By the time (1767) of the expulsion of the Jesuits--who were also in Spanish America the major educational promoter, in this case, not only of secondary schools but also of universitites--23 universities and a much greater number of colleges, seminaries and conventual schools had been established in the principal cities of South America.[108] Puerto Rico, however, was mostly at the margins of these developments. As was remarked before, whatever was available in Puerto Rico in secondary and higher education was what was offered in the cathedral and the Dominican and Franciscan convents, and what is known about these offerings is very little and fragmentary. There is information that suggests that at some point during their existence before 1765, Latin grammar and the liberal arts were tautht in them, but there are long

periods where nothing is known about their educational activities. Cuesta Mendoza, as yet the most through educational historian of this period, tends to fill these historically blank periods with extrapolations suggesting that the educational activities of these institutions were rather continuous and measuring to the standards of the time;[109] but the available evidence, not just that regarding those institutions--otherwise well accounted by him--but of the overall stituation of the Island lends very scanty support to his suggestions. One must remember, before considering what in effect is known about the offerings in Latin grammar and liberal arts of those institutions, that the broader social condition of Puerto Rico did not call for more than a rudimentary development in secondary education. Indeed, it is not surprising to expect that in a situation characterized, to repeat, by limited urban, productive and commercial development; by the extreme lack of private, municipal, State and Church revenues; by very few and small legal-administrative and ecclesiastical bureaucracies and operation; by the disperse and self subsistence living of the vast majority of the population; and by a miniscule and relatively poor landed and bourgeois sector, there was little effective demand from any social segment for a secondary and high educational as was the case for primary education. In

all of these background conditions and, not only with respect to formal education, was Puerto Rico greatly lagging relative to most of the other Hispanic America colonies.

It is true that as early as 1512 during the beginning of the colonization and while the Spaniards were still enjoying the gold bonanza of Puerto Rico, and still thinking of the favorable economic prospects of the Island, its recently appointed first bishop, even before leaving Spain to assume his insular ecclesiastical post, was including as part of his elaborate plans for his diocese the establishment of a cathedral and the opening of a school of Latin grammar for both intending priests and secular students.[110] But the building of the cathedral in San Juan was not started until a decade later, and while the complaints regarding the lack of revenues of the bishopric are frequent there is no documentation of the Latin grammar school until 1544, when the second bishop of the Island suggested to the Crown the convenience of establishing one such class in the cathedral.[111] A few years after that date the bishop reports the ordainment by him of 4 priests, which could be taken as an indication that at least the rudiments of Latin and theology were taught in the cathedral during his bishopric.[112] The next available information regarding the teaching of Latin grammar in the cathedral is that it

received endowments from two citizens of San Juan, one made at some unkown date before 1582, and the other in 1589, endowments which apparently allowed the Latin grammar class to be offered more or less on a continuous basis at least until 1644 when 24 latin grammar students were reported in the cathedral.[113] After this date, and through the end of the 17th century, several grammar teachers appear to have been appointed for the cathedral;[114] however, in all it appears that the educational activities of this establishment, if present at all, remained very limited throughout this century and through the first half of the 18th century, as the revenue producing legal economy plunged deeper into stagnation along with the overall insular governmental and Church apparatuses. Particularly relevant in this regard are the remarks of the bishop of Puerto Rico in 1712 commenting on the pathetic situation of the Church and its clergy, for according to him there was no licensed priest on the Island, while the only 2 or 3 candidates for ordainment into priesthood know little Latin grammar.[115] To remedy this situation, the same bishop proposed the establishment of a college--seminary for the rigorous training of the clergy, but his proposal did not go through and no such seminary was to be established in Puerto Rico until the 19th century.[116]

The remarks of the bishop in 1712 can be taken also as a comment of the educational activities of the Dominican and Franciscan convents. The Dominican convent, the oldest and more important of the two, had had earlier in its existence, richer and more promising moments both materially and educationally. Already by 1524, only a few years after its construction was started, the convent had 25 religious members of which some perhaps were novitiates, as apparently the convent also served as a novitiate school of the religious order.[117] The Dominicans were at the time going through an expanding and prosperous phase--in contrast, by the way, with what was happening with the bishopric and the cathedral--deriving a large part of their revenues from its direct involvement in the economy of the Island both as cattle ranchers and sugar producers, activities in which ironically they employed the forced labor not only of black slaves, but also of Indian workers and this despite their previous humanitarian efforts in the treatment of the latter.[118] In spite such material prosperity it appears that their educational activities remained very restricted during this period, as the only information regarding such endeavors points to the absence or limited number of a qualified training clergy in the convent.[119] Moreover, with the decline of the insular economy in the second

part of the 16th century, the fortunes of the Dominicans fell sharply and the religious community decreased in number: thus by 1582 only 10 convent friars are reported, while sometimes later, but before the fifth decade of the 17th century, its novitiate was transferred to the neighboring island of the Hispaniola.[120] The 1640s was a decade of renewal and expansion for the Dominican convent--probably motivated by the war between Spain and Portugal and by the resulting need of replacing the great number of Portuguese friars in the order with Spanish-loyal ones--with the growing of its religious members to 80, the reopening of the noviate, the establishment of classes of Latin grammar and arts, and the attempts, by the central offices of the order in Spain, to turn the novitiate into a provincial "studium generale", perhaps as a first step toward making it an eventual university, a step however which usually required the authorization of the pope and, in the case of Spain, that of the Crown.[121] No such authorization followed, and there is no evidence that the "studium generale" in the convent was established or that it ever operated, and indeed it is very likely that it never did for the overall situation of deep stagnation of the insular Church, economy or the government, did not justify it.

The 1640s saw also the foundation of the San

Franciscan convent. Smaller than the Dominican, it had also a lesser academic importance than the latter, and it appears that apart from the Spanish grammar classes which as noted above were taught there, it functioned during the next 100 years as a mere small novitiate teaching the rudiments of Latin grammar and arts. In 1644, 6 students were reported there, that is, the same number of novitiates that O'Reylly reported in 1765 more than a century later.[122] By this time, by the way, the number of novitiates in the Dominican convent had fallen even below that of the Franciscans, to that of 4.[123]

Thus, no university was established in Puerto Rico before 1765, and in fact, none was to be established during the whole period under Spanish rule, even though, as shall be seen in the next Chapter, non-degree university level courses in law, medicine and pharmacy were to be offered in the 19th century in various locations in San Juan. Nonetheless, since the beginnings of the colonization, and despite the great hardship that it represented for even the wealthier families of the Island, a few of the sons of these families managed to pursue higher ecclesiastical and professional studies in the universities and degree-granting colleges of Spain and of the other Spanish American colonies. This started a practice of university studies abroad that was to

become more frequent since the second half of the 18th century with the growth in number and increasing prosperity after that period of the insular landed and urban bourgeois classes, classes who in spite of this would fail in their various attemps to establish a university in Puerto Rico.

In all, by 1765 probably less than 5 percent of the population of Puerto Rico was literate, and only a handful had had some from of university education, but the overall insular situation barely required literacy of any of the social classes--and barely made it worthwhile for any of them--while university education was of little use to even the sons of the elite, wealthier classes, for there were in the Island very few career opportunities--whether in teaching, the liberal professions, the government, the Church or commerce--which required such training. From one perspective it may be argued that this situation deprived most of the insular inhabitants of whatever benefits could be associated with literacy and formal education, from another perspective it could be argued that as yet most of these people were also relatively free from the ideological control and/or social educational stratification which most likely would have resulted from a more extended and effective network of schools under

the control of the Church and the colonial government, that privileged the dominant bureaucratic, landed and bourgeois classes. Indeed, from this latter perspective, it could be argued that the situation of most of the islanders with respect to formal education was merely a reflection of their overall political, economic and cultural situation, in one sense largely at the margins of any significant developments in these areas, given their dispersed rustic and self-subsistence existence, but also relatively free from the supervision and encroachments from the "hacendados", the commercial bourgeoisie, the colonial bureaucracy and the clergy.

FOOTNOTES

[1]The main sources on the general history of Spain and its colonial enterprise during the period covered by this Chapter that were used for this study are: Altamira (1960), Elliot (1966), Haring (1963), Payne (1973, Vol.I), Stein (1970), Vicens Vives (1959), and Vicens Vives et al (1972, Vols.I and II). Also very useful were the brief histories by Vicens Vives (1967) and Vilar (1967). On the general history of Puerto Rico during this period, the works that were consulted are: Abbad y Lasierra (1971), Alegría (1969), Brau (1966a, 1966b), Fernández Méndez (1975), Figueroa (1968), López (1974a), Morales Carrión (1974, 1980), Perea (1972), Silén (1973), and Steward et al (1956). Useful compilations of historical documents of Puerto Rico covering this period are Caro Costas (1980), Fernández Méndez (1976), and Tapia y Rivera (1945).

[2]Vilar (1967:11-16).

[3]See, for instance, Gutiérrez del Arroyo (1974), Haring (1963:147-148), and Vilar (1967:13-14).

[4]Vilar (1967:25).

[5]Braudel (1976, Vol.II:677).

[6]See Vicens Vives et al (1972, Vol.III:71,164-166).

[7]Kagan (1974:62-63,200).

[8]See Braudel (1976, Vol.II:681-683), Kagan (1974: 82-87), and Stein (1978:73).

[9]Bowen (1975, Vol.II:420-435).

[10]Haring (1963:184-187).

[11]On the decline of the Spanish empire, see among others Frank (1978:71-74), Vicens Vives (1967:104-113), Vilar (1967:44-47), and Wallerstein (1974:165-221).

[12]Haring (1963:306-312), Morales Carrión (1974), and Wallerstein (1980:157-164).

[13]Frank (1978:92-94), Vicens Vives et al (1972, Vol. III:504-512), Wallerstein (1980:147-162).

[14]Morales Carrión (1974).

[15]On the Taínos, see Alegría (1969, 1980), Gómez Acevedo and Ballesteros Gaibrois (1980), Moscoso (1980), and Sued Badillo (1978, 1979).

[16]Gómez Acevedo and Ballesteros Gaibros (1980:76), Steward et al (1956:35), Vázquez (1968:5).

[17]Vázquez (1968:5-6).

[18]On this point and on the general treatment of the American indigenous people by the Spaniards, see Haring (1963) and Vicens Vives et al (1972, Vol.III).

[19]See Tapia y Rivera (1945:202-273), also Haring (1963:40-44), Vicens Vives et al (1972, Vol.III:341).

[20]Haring (1963), Vicens Vives et al (1963).

[21]Coll y Toste (1922:96).

[22]Tapia y Rivera (1945:112, 158).

[23]Tapia y Rivera (1945:202-206)

[24]Haring (1963:208-218), Vicens Vives et al (1972, Vol.III:364-374, 480-487).

[25]Hostos (1966:312-314), Perea (1972:186-187).

[26]Ots Capdequi (1946:18).

[27]Haring (1963:52-54), Ots Capdequi (1946:38), Vicens Vives et al (1972, Vol.III:362).

[28]Díaz Soler (1974:33-40).

[29]Brau (1966a:70-71), Díaz Soler (1974:43-49), Haring (1963:203-204), Vázquez (1968:7).

[30]Díaz Soler (1974:202-203), Fernández Méndez (1975:111), Haring (1963:206).

[31]Díaz Soler (1974:67-68), Vila Vilar (1974:33).

[32]Díaz Soler (1974:232-237), Morales Carrión (1974: 67-68).

[33]Brau (1966a:155).

[34]Brau (1966a:199).

[35]Mathews (1963:299-323), Schermerhorn (1978:100, 117), Steward et al (1956:408-410).

[36]Haring (1963:197-203), Vicens Vives et al (1972, Vol.III:502-503).

[37]Figueroa (1970:154), Haring (1963:202), Vicens Vives et al (1972, Vol.III:397-398).

[38]Figueroa (1970:147-156), Mathews (1974:302-304).

[39]Brau (1966a:199).

[40]See also Table 1.

[41]See the descriptions by Abbad y Lasierra (1971) and O"Reylly in Caro Costas (1980:453-484), both of whom visited Puerto Rico during the 1770s.

[42]Steward et al (1956:48).

[43]Abbad y Lasierra (1971), and the report by O'Reylly in Caro Costas (1980:453-484).

[44]Caro Costas (1980:476-481).

[45]For a comprehensive history of the city of San Juan, see Hostos (1966).

[46]Morales Carrión (1974); also Figueroa (1968:103-104).

[47]Haring (1963:168), Lanning (1940:10, 12-14), Ots Capdequi (1946:179-180).

[48]Haring (1963:94-109), Ots Capdequi (1946:73-74), Trías Monge (1980:13-15).

[49]Haring (1963:101-107).

[50]Fernández Méndez (1975:66-67), Haring (1963:297-298), Hostos (1966:289).

[51]Haring (1963:110-120), Trías Monge (1980:16-17). The title of captain-general was applied to the governors of Puerto Rico from 1582 to 1898, a title which reflected the military importance of the Island for Spain. Before 1582, Puerto Rico was ruled by diverse forms of governmental authorities: from 1509 to 1537, by liutenant-governors who were under the authority of the governor of the Hispaniola; between 1537 and 1544, by the "alcaldes ordinarios" (town mayors) of the Island; from 1544 to 1564, by the so-called "gobernadores letrados" (legal magistrate governors); and from 1564 to 1582, by military governors. See Figueroa (1968).

[52]Haring (1963:120-127), Trías Monge (1980:22-23).

[53]Not until 1831 was an Audiencia established in Puerto Rico; from 1800 to 1831, Puerto Rico was under the jurisdiction of the Audiencia of Puerto Prıncipe in Cuba. Trías Monge (1980:17).

[54]These interventions appear to have diminished as the insular settlers became more worried with the French, English and Dutch threats in the Caribbean than with the activities of the local governors; also because such threats made travels to Santo Domingo more difficult, and because both settlers and governors became more identified with each other as a result of their common involvement in the flourishing contraband trade. See Vila Vilar (1974:61-64).

[55]Haring (1963:194), Ots Capdequi (1946:33).

[56]Haring (1963:195), Stein (1970:71).

[57]Abbad y Lasierra (1971:200-201).

[58]Figueroa (1968:103-104).

[59]Coll y Toste (1980:690-691), Fernández Méndez (1975:156), Haring (1963:156), Ots Capdequi (1946:50-54), Vicens Vives et al (1972), Vol.III:346-350).

[60]Caro Costas (1980:583-633), Gutiérrez del Arroyo (1974:23-24), Haring (1963:156).

[61]Fernández Méndez (1975:124-125), Haring (1963:155).

[62]Fernández Méndez (1975:125), Haring (1963:197-198).

[63]Fernández Méndez (1975:123-124).

[64]Caro Costas (1980:473); see also Hostos (1966:314-315), Steward et al (1956:44).

[65]Haring (1963:198-199), Hostos (1966:9-10), Ots Capdequi (1946:8).

[66]Haring (1963:226-227), Hostos (1966:419-420), Pedreira (1969:34-35).

[67]Steward et al (1956:44).

[68]Hostos (1966:9-15), Steward et al (1956:44).

[69]Haring (1963:226), Hostos (1966:419).

[70]Cruz Monclova (1965:18), Hostos (1966:411), Pedreira (1969:33-34).

[71]Haring (1963:228-230).

[72]Hostos (1966:405-406)

[73]Kagan (1974:23).

[74]Lockridge (1974:13, 88), Stone (1969:127-128).

[75]Kagan (1974:23).

[76]Kagan (1974:9-17).

[77]Elliot (1966:222-223).

[78]Kagan (1974:11).

[79]Kagan (1974:1-17).

[80]Kagan (1974:15-17).

[81]Kagan (1974:17).

[82]Cipolla (1970:56), Stone (1969:78).

[83]Stone (1969:77-79); see also Lockbridge (1974).

[84]Cipolla (1970), Lockridge (1974), Stone (1969).

[85]Cipolla (1970:72).

[86]Cipolla (1979:71-72), Stone (1969:129).

[87]Caro Costas (1980:456).

[88]Coll y Toste (1910:15), Osuna (1949:17).

[89]Cuesta Mendoza (1937:96, 113-115).

[90]Cuesta Mendoza (1937:84, 115).

[91]Brau (1966b:529), Cuesta Mendoza (1937:73-74, 86)

[92]Cuesta Mendoza (1937:96-97)

[93]Perea (1972:187).

[94]Cuesta Mendoza (1937:97-99).

[95]Cuesta Mendoza (1937:97-98).

[96]Steward et al (1956:42); on Spanish guilds, see Vicens Vives et al (1972,Vol.III:92-94).

[97]Quintero Rivera (1978:103).

[98]Haring (1963: 203, 253), Vicens Vives et al (1972, Vol.III:495).

[99]Kagan (1974:27-29), Vicens Vives et al (1972, Vol.III:186-188, 435-437); for a sexist interpretation of such development, see Hostos (1966:397).

[100]Hostos (1966:338), Vila Vilar (1974:30).

[101]On this development, see Aries (1965:137-154), Bowen (1975, Vol.II:37-34).

[102]These terms had different origins: The "universitas" referring initially to any legal corporation like the medieval municipalities or towns, or to any guild, including the guild of masters and scholars which served as the antecedant of later and present day universities; the "stadium generale" meaning literally any place of study receiving students from all regions. Over time some of the "universitas" of masters and scholars gained increasing reputation and attracted teachers and students

from all over Europe, receiving accordingly the title of "stadium generale" and from then of the two terms began to be associated and even used interchangeably though eventually the latter fell into disuse. See Rashdall (1936, Vol.I:1-20).

[103]Lanning (1940:10), Rashdall (1936, Vol.I:8-13, Vol.II:75).

[104]Kagan (1947:60).

[105]Kagan (1974:40-61); see also Aries (1965:171-172).

[106]Kagan (1974:219-230).

[107]Kagan (1974:40-61). More will be said on this expulsion in Chapter III.

[108]Haring (1963:208-214), Lanning (1940:12-33)

[109]Cuesta Mendoza (1937, 1946).

[110]Tapia y Rivera (1945:371-386).

[111]Tapia y Rivera (1945:340).

[112]Cuesta Mendoza (1937:56, 121).

[113]See Caro Costas (1980:183, 326-327, 359), Osuna (1949:12).

[114]Cuesta Mendoza (1937:61).

[115]Cuesta Mendoza (1937:86-87), Hostos (1966:343-344).

[116]Cuesta Mendoza (1937:150), Hostos (1966:343).

[117]Cuesta Mendoza (1937:75).

[118]Tapia y Rivera (1945:344); see also Morales Carrión (1972:67-69).

[119]Tapia y Rivera (1945:339); see also Cuesta Mendoza (1937:77).

[120]Caro Costas (1980:182, 327).

[121]Caro Costas (1980:327), Cuesta Mendoza (1937:80),

Perea (1972:190).

[122]Caro Costas (1980:473), Osuna (1949:13).

[123]Caro Costas (1980:473).

C H A P T E R I I I

SCHOOLING UNDER SPANISH RULE: FROM THE MIDDLE OF THE 18th CENTURY TO 1898

The "Enlightened Depotism" and Colonialism of the Bourbons

In 1700, the Hapsburgs were replaced by the Bourbons as the ruling monarchic dynasty in Spain, a change that while bitterly contested by Britain and other European powers in the War of Spanish Succession (1702-1714) in which the Spanish lost Gibraltar and its imperial possessions in Europe; it nevertheless led to the firm establishment of the Bourbons in Spain and to an eventual period of national and imperial recovery in the peninsula and in America.[1] Through a series of administrative, fiscal and military reforms, the Bourbons made the Spanish State and the colonial bureaucracy more centralized and efficient, more in control of the Catholic Church and over the general culture sphere, and less restraint by local provincial or municipal rights and privileges (i.e., by the "fueros") than it ever was during the Catholic Kings or the Hapsburgs. Moreover, the reforms succeeded not only in increasing the administrative, taxing and coercive power of the monarchy, or in improving the military and naval defenses of its

American colonies (mainly against the attacks of Britain, which became Spain's major rival power during the 18th century), but also in fostering the commercial economy of both the metropolis and the colonies, including the trade between the two (and this despite of the Crown's mercantilistic policies designed to exploit the colonies in favor primarily of Spanish merchant, agricultural and industrial interests). The most important of these reforms were undertaken during the second half of the 18th century, particularly during the reign of Charles III (1759-1788), and it was during this period that they were of more direct relevance to Puerto Rico.

In their reforms the Spanish Bourbons at first followed very closely the model of royal absolutism and State mercantilism ("Colbertism") of the French monarchs--who were by the way also Bourbons--but later they were greatly influenced by the European Enlightenment, particularly by the political example of the so called "enlightened despots" and the experimental rationalism formulated by French and English thinkers, an influence which climaxed during the rule of Charles III.[2] Thus, in their efforts, Charles and his reformist ministers (Aranda, Floridablanca, Campomones and Jovellanos) attempted to build not only an absolute State, but one that was

"enlightened" in the sense both of its legal-administrative rationality and efficacy and of its capacity for imposing the "modernizing" economic and educational changes needed, according to the reformers, to raise the Spanish society to the level of economic, scientific and technical advance achieved by other European nation-states and colonial powers. From the Enlightenment the Bourbons took the guiding rationalist belief that a scientifically and critically informed reason could solve practically all earthly problems while liberating humanity from error, superstition and misery.

But like other "enlightened despots", the Spanish monarchs were very selective in their attempts to diffuse and implement these rationalist ideas. Thus, while they took important steps toward liberalizing the economy in a "laissez-faire" sense (namely, by eliminating some of the monopoly privileges of the royal trade companies, trading ports and artisan guilds, and by generalizing private-property rights over royal, municipal, Church and aristocratic lands) popularizing scientific and technical knowledge, and incorporating this type of knowledge in the development of agriculture and manufacturing and in the

administration of the State; the Bourbons (and the members of the nobility and of the upper classes who collaborated with them, or of the rising bourgeois commercial and

industrial interests who benefited from their policies) had little concern and gave no support to the principles of political liberalism which also came out of the Enlightenment and which found its most influential and dramatic expression in 1776 and 1789 in the North American and French revolutions. In fact, when such political liberal ideas as the "riths of men" and of "popular" or "national sovereignty" began to be disseminated in both Spain and its American colonies as a result of those revolutions, challenging accordingly the royal absolutisms of the monarchs, these quickly moved to check and supress their influence. Politically then, the Bourbon reformers were firm believers of the idea that only a strong absolute monarch could implement the modernizing changes needed by Spain and its people to achieve--even against their will--their socioeconomic and intellectual progress.

Despite their rationalist influences, the Bourbons and most of their collaborators remained strongly attached to the Catholic faith; nonetheless, in their efforts to enhance the power of the monarchy and to implement their economic and educational reforms, they were driven into major conflicts with the Catholic hierarchy and, most dramatically, with the Jesuit order. In a sense, their assertion of the authority of the Crown over the Church and

its orders was only a continuation of the "regalist" policies (i.e. policies favoring the increase of royal power vis-a-vis the Church) of the Catholic Kings and the Hapsburgs, a trend interrupted during the reign of the last of the Hapsburgs, when the papacy was able to regain much influence over the appointments and material affairs of the Spanish Church.[4] But the Bourbons renewed the regalist tradition with greater force and extension than any of their predecessors, partly because the papacy had opposed them during the War of Spanish Succession, but more fundamentally because of the threat and obstacles that a powerful international organization like the Catholic Church presented to their royal absolutism and reforms, particularly as the Church had come to control large concentration of peninsular and Spanish American lands (held mostly, like the entailed estates of the nobility, in mortmain, that is, in a form of possession which could not be alienated or sold, nor taxed) and to practically monopolize school education and refractory of the empirical rationalism of the Enlightenment). The main target of the Bourbons were the Jesuits who aside from their extensive control over productive lands and over secondary and higher and secondary education in both Spain and Spanish America, had become the principal representatives of the papacy in Western and Central Europe and one of the major opponents of the

Enlightenment and of the Bourbon's regalism. The conflict with the Jesuits reached a climatic point during the reign of Charles III, who increasingly questioned the loyalty of the Jesuits to the Crown, and after making them the scapegoats of a popular riot that broke out in Madrid in 1766, deported them from all the Spanish domains in 1767 to the papal domains (a measure, incidentally, which had already been taken against the Jesuits in Portugal (1759) and France (1764) and which interestingly was largely supported by other elements and orders of the Church who resented the great wealth and influence of the Jesuits). Educationally the expulsion of the Jesuits marked an important change in Church-State relationships, as it increased considerably the influence of the Crown over secondary and university education, a development that will be discussed later in this section.

One of the principal priorities of the Bourbons in attempting to rebuild Spain's power was to re-establish the commercial trade with its colonies, a trade which had been significantly reduced in large measure because of the flourishing contraband activities of the Spanish Americans and the English, French, Dutch and North American smugglers.[5] In themselves, the attempts to counteract the contraband were rather unsuccessful for such trade continued

to flourish in the colonies, including Puerto Rico, well into the first half of the 19th century; nevertheless, the legal trade between Spain and its colonies expanded and so did consequently the revenues for the Crown and the colonial bureaucracies coming from the high taxes and duties on the increased export-import commerce. An enlarged colonial commerce was fundamental for increasing the revenues of the Crown, but in fostering such expansion, the Bourbons were specifically concerned not so much with the overall commercial development of the colonies but rather with expanding the commercial outlets for Spanish agricultural and industrial commodities while on the other hand developing those Spanish American staples and raw materials which were in demand in Spain. In Puerto Rico, for example, the staples that were to benefit more from this renewed mercantilistic trade policy were sugar, coffee, tobacco and cotton, although it is appropriate to remember that the last three staples were to some extent also benefiting from the ongoing contraband exchanges.

Thus, in order to expand the legal mercantilistic trade and reduce the smuggling, the monarchs first experimented with charter companies that were granted monopoly privileges over various trade routes between Spain and its colonies. The most important and prosperous of these were the Caracas, La Habana and the Barcelona

companies, organized respectively in 1728, 1740 and 1756; of which the latter two--the Barcelona since 1756 and the Caracas since 1770--were granted privilege rights in the export-import commerce of Puerto Rico. However, while these companies were instrumental in expanding to some extent the commerce between the metropolis and its colonies, they soon engaged in the prosperous contraband trade, thus depriving the Crown of the benefits of the enlarged commerce. At any rate, during the last third of the 18th century the charter companies declined considerably in importance as the Bourbons slowly liberalized trade throughout the empire, a new policy trend that was to give ever greater stimulus to the export-import commerce in the colonies.[6]

The attempts to liberalize trade--consisting basically in the gradual reduction of the mercantile monopolies and privileges of the charter companies and certain ports--were particularly evident since 1765 when a number of Spanish ports other than Cadiz and Seville were legally opened to trade with the Spanish West Indies, including Puerto Rico, and when the colonies themselves were gradually allowed to do commerce among themselves. This started a trend toward greater "free" trade which in subsequent years, most notably in 1778, was extended to practically all the main ports of the empire.[7] But while such

liberalization greatly expanded the legal commerce between Spain and Spanish America--and hence the custom revenues of the Crown--it still restricted trade to only a few ports --in Puerto Rico, for example, only to San Juan--and with few exceptions, the most notable being the slave trade, it limited commerce to within the empire, a policy which did not stop the contraband trade even in the newly legalized ports. However, with the events at the turn of the century which were to plunge again Spain into a deep political and economic crisis, and which marked the end of the "enlightened depotism" and reformism of the Bourbons, the Crown was drastically forced to open its colonies to non-Hispanic traders. Accordingly, in 1793, Spain went into war against revolutionary France and ended by losing Santo Domingo to the French in 1795. Furthermore, in 1796 it entered ironically into an alliance with France itself, an alliance which led in turn to a more disastrous war (1796-1802) against England, in which the British not only captured Trinidad from Spain,[8] but perhaps more damaging for Spanish interests, it successfully cut the commerce of the Spanish peninsula with its American colonies. To cope with this situation, the Crown allowed the colonies in 1797 to trade with neutral countries, a measure which benefited chiefly the U.S. whose merchants had for a long time participated in the contraband trade with the Spanish colonies.[9] Since

1797 and through the 19th century U.S. trade with Spanish America would increase considerably, and it would even do so between 1799-1804 when Spain, greatly concerned about losing permanently a good share of its colonial markets to the recently established North American republic, tried unsuccessfully to stop such trend by revoking the 1797 decree. As the contraband commerce with the U.S. could not be halted, even less so when the war with Britain was renewed in 1804, the Spanish Crown concluded that with the legitimation of trade it at least could collect some custom duties. Incidentally, in that year the Crown also ordered the opening of 5 ports in Puerto Rico in addition to the one in San Juan. Thus by the beginning of the 19th century Puerto Rico and the rest of the Spanish colonies were doing legal commerce with non-Hispanic countries and were well in the process of becoming the major trading market of the U.S.[10]

Along with their reluctant attempts to liberalize trade, the Bourbons attempted some land reforms both in the peninsula and their colonial domains which were geared to bring more land under commercial cultivation as well as to increase the revenues of the government.[11] Some of the efforts along these lines were rather mild, such for example were the attempts to disentail the inmense tracts of land in the hands of the upper nobility and the clergy,

the principal exception in this respect being the already mentioned confiscation of the property of the expelled Jesuits in 1767. On the whole, the attempts to disentail Church lands would not be firmly pursued until after the end of the 18th century, and at any rate such attempts were rather irrelevant for Puerto Rico for in the Island unlike most of the rest of the Spanish empire the Church had little entailed land. More effective land reform efforts, and at the same time more relevant for Puerto Rico, were the attempts to turn pasture lands and unattended municipal and royal ("realengas") lands into private commercial farms and, consequently, into revenue generating sources for the government.[12] In Puerto Rico, most of the land was used either for grazing cattle or simply left unattended; on the other hand, a large part of the land, whether cultivated or not, was owned by the Crown or the municipalities while a large number of persons who claimed its ownership or who used it for grazing their animals or who even cultivated it, had no clear property titles over the land. Thus, to deal with this situation, and hence to encourage commercial cultivation and to raise governmental revenues, a series of measures were implemented between 1757 and 1778 designed to grant individual property rights to farmers who were already cultivating the land or who were planning to do so, and to ranchers who moved or were willing to move their cattle to

non-arable grazing lands or to the interior highlands of the Island. The granting of the property rights entailed the payment by the beneficiary of an annual land tax which interestingly enough was to be used, according to the 1778 royal order which was the culminating law of the insular land reform, for the maintenance of the insular militia, a body in charge among other things of ensuring public order and, hence, in helping to fight the widespread contraband activities.[13]

In their efforts to stimulate the growth of commercial agriculture in Puerto Rico, the Crown was particularly concerned with expanding the production of sugar, coffee and tobacco, export staples much in demand in Spain and the rest of Europe. To stimulate, for instance, coffee production, its growers received in 1768 a tax exemption for five years, and already by 1775 coffee, which had been introduced to the Island only four decades earlier (1736), had become one of the most important local cash crops.[14] In the case of tobacco, on the other hand, the government authorized the establishment in 1785 of La Factoría, an establishment designed to stimulate tobacco exports to Europe. But it was sugar, however, the export crop of primary consideration for the Crown, which was interested in reviving such chronically stagnating industry. The same 1778 royal order which generalized the rights of private

property in Puerto Rico, permitted also the immigration of settlers with sugar producing skills and equipment on the condition that they were Catholics and pledged their allegiance to the Spanish Crown.[15] Moreover, measures were undertaken to supply sugar planters with the necessary labor force, that is to say, with black slaves. Accordingly, a company was established in 1765--the Aguirre, Ariztegui and Company--to provide Puerto Rico and other Spanish West Indies with black slaves, however it appears that very few slaves were in fact introduced by this company which became more interested in the contraband traffic of other commodities.[16] Later, nevertheless, the Crown allowed for greater liberality in the introduction of slaves; for example, in 1780, it permitted the purchase of slaves in the neighboring French colonies and in 1789 it allowed both Spanish and foreign traders to introduce slaves free of duty.[17] With such measures, along with the gradual liberalization of all trade, the sugar industry in Puerto Rico began to slowly recover and expand. But the great boost to its growth in the Island--as well as to that in Cuba--came as a result not of Bourbons' reforms but of the destruction in the 1790s of Haiti's sugar economy, the most prosperous in the Caribbean, a consequence of the fierce and bloody revolutionary struggle of the slaves in that French colony. This upheaval not only opened the

European sugar markets, previously supplied by Haiti's producers, to the planters in the Spanish colonies, but also brought to these, Puerto Rico included, with the encouragement of the colonial authorities, many of the French planters who were forced out of Haiti, and who brought with them both capital resources and sugar producing techniques.[18]

It should be noted that the efforts of the Spanish authorities to attract settlers to Puerto Rico during the 18th century was not only designed to encourage sugar production; rather it was considered as part of a broader policy of developing the capacities of the settlers and the colonial authorities to exploit and defend the commercial potentialities of the Island, a policy which apart from attempting to increase agricultural production and governmental revenues and to improve the military defenses of the Island, included efforts to populate the latter and to establish and expand its urban settlements.[19] Thus, aside from the efforts to attract large planters and/or slaves, the Crown encouraged the immigration, for example, of small farmers and artisans (a large number from the Canary Islands), of the previously mentioned runaway slaves from the neighboring non-Hispanic colonies--a policy which continued well into the second half of the 18th century--, of Catalan merchants (many of whom came with the charter

mercantile companies). And to these one has to add the large number of soldiers who came to Puerto Rico to reinforce its defenses according to the recommendations of O'Reylly in his 1765 report; as well as the large number of families, mostly of farmers and government bureaucrats who immigrated to Puerto Rico from Santo Domingo when Spain ceded it to France in 1795 and, later, when the Haitian revolutionaries occupied the whole Hispaniola. All of these and other immigrations contributed significantly to the dramatic growth of the insular population during the 18th century. As noted in the previous Chapter, the population of the Island was already steadily growing through the first half of the century, but the growth accelerated during the second half; thus between 1765 and 1802, the population grew from 44,883 to 163,192, that is, it more than tripled (See Table 1). During the same period the slave population also grew significantly--that is, from 5,037 to 13,333--, largely reflecting the parallel expansion of the sugar industry; but as Table 1 shows for the years 1777-1802, the growth of the slave population was slower than that of the non-white one. On the other hand, the dramatic rise of the insular population was accompanied by the establishment of a number of towns and settlements; thus, if by the beginning of the century there were on the Island 4 towns, by 1759 there were around 19 towns and

rural settlements and by the end of the century these had grown to 34.[20] Despite this growth in population and towns, the urban concentrations did not expand considerably--for instance, San Juan's population, still Puerto Rico's largest, remained under 10,000 by the end of the century--and the Island remained basically sparsely populated. And indeed, in spite of the growth of commercial agriculture and trade, the vast majority of its people remained by the turn of the 19th century dispersed throughout the rural areas and living from subsistence farming.

One interesting aspect of these developments is that they provided the basis for the increasing power and expansion in Puerto Rico of three social groups which were to play dominant social roles in the social and political struggles of the 19th century. First, there was a numerically larger and institutionally stronger colonial bureaucratic (and military) sector almost exclusively composed of Spanish-born administrators and officials who monopolized political and military power. Secondly, there was an increasingly richer merchant sector, also principally composed of peninsular Spaniards, who controlled the internal commerce and legal export-import trade of the Island. And thirdly, there was a growingly well-off commercial and export oriented landowning sector of hacendados, with an important component of creole families

and of recently established foreign and exiled immigrants, the latter also becoming in time part of the insular creole elite. Though by the end of the 18th century this landed elite was relatively poor and politically weak--compared for example with its counterparts in the other Spanish American colonies--it would become richer and stronger through the 19th century, and together with its liberal intellectual and professional offsprings would increasingly challenge the hegemonic political and economic groups in the Island, specifically the Spanish-born colonial bureaucratic and merchant sectors. Notwithstanding this, and as shall be seen in subsequent sections of this Chapter, the insular landed elite would also seek and get the support of the colonial governmental apparatus in attempting to secure slave labor and/or forcing the large number of idependent subsistence peasants to work in the former's haciendas.

In any case, it is important to have in mind that this was an insular creole elite that had come progressively in touch not only with the kind of "enlightened" liberalism propagated by the Bourbons--limited basically to economic liberalism and to the application of a technical-scientific rationality to production and the administration of the State--but also with the political liberalism of English

and French philosophers as well as of the North American and French revolutions of 1776 and 1789.[21]

However, it should also be noted in this latter respect that the insular elite was to receive a strong influence in an opposite conservative direction, namely that which came since the 1790s with the influx of French exiles from Haiti many of whom greatly resented the liberal political ideals of the French revolution. On the other hand, it is worth remembering that the difussion of liberal ideals in Puerto Rico was at any rate far slower and encountered far greater obstacles than in Spain and much of Spanish America. As noted in the previous Chapter, the circulation of books and printed material pertaining to the Enlightenment philosophers and to the ideals of the U.S. and French revolutions was quite extensive among the intellectual sectors of most of the Spanish American elites, while in Puerto Rico such difussion--like that of any kind of printed material--was fairly limited. Moreover, as also noted in that Chapter, while during the 18th century the number of printed presses greatly increased in much of Spanish America, some of which were printing clandestine political materials, no press appeared on the Island until the beginning of the 19th century.[22]

Neither was there established in Puerto Rico until the

1810s a branch of what constituted perhaps the principal agency for the dissemination of the reformist ideas of the Bourbons during the second half of the 18th century, that is, the "Sociedades Económicas de Amigos del País" (Economic Societies of the Friends of the Country). Modeled on the Basque Society of Friends of the Country founded in 1765, and based on local initiative (though this was done generally be only a small minority of the local population composed basically of "progressive" aristocrats, urban bourgeois and professionals and a few reformist clergymen) and, particularly since 1774, with the enthusiastic and patronizing support of the Crown, these societies soon spread over Spain and, toward the end of the century, its American colonies, engaging in the active promotion of commerce, agriculture and industry, of new agricultural and industrial methods, and of so-called "useful" knowledge and popular education, that is of a type of public technical and scientific education, that could be useful both for the overall economic prosperity of the nation as well as for enhancing the authority of the State.[23]

Interestingly enough, most of the important educational innovations attempted by the Bourbon reformers took place outside of the walls of the Latin schools and the universities. Such was the case of the creation not just of the Economic Societies but also of the royal academies (of

linguistic studies--de la lengua--, history, fine arts, letters, law and medicine); of technical and scientific institutes and seminaries (the most famous being the Seminario de Vergara founded by the Basque Society of Friends of the Country, and the Instituto de Gijón, founded by Jovellanos, a government minister and the leading Spanish theorist of economic liberalism and economic reform), natural science museums, botanic gardens and public libraries.[24] Similar cultural and scientific bodies sprung up in large number in many of the cities of Spanish America, though again not so in Puerto Rico.[25] The Island, however, was visited in 1797-1798 by one of the many expeditions by European scientists who came to Spanish America during the 18th century--the most famous of which was the one led by Humbolt, the great German scholar, in the years 1799-1804, to Mexico and northern South America--and which had great influence over intellectual circles in that region.[26]

Apart from these developments there were important attempts by the Bourbon reformers, particularly since the expulsion of the Jesuits, to "modernize" and gain increasing control over formal education. Such attempts marked a major thrust of the Crown in directly intervening in the educational sphere and in making it a central instrument of national policy. However, despite the impetus

given to the administrative and curricular reforms in this sphere, the actual reforms were rather modest, and encountered strong resistance. Thus, for instance, many of the clergy and professors of the universities, which were the major focus of the educational reforms of the "enlightened" ministers of Charles III, presented great resistance to such attempts; and while a number of the universities incorporated new studies with an Enlightenment orientation (e.g. physical-natural sciences, political economy, Spanish law), most maintained a very traditional scholastic curriculum in their classical faculties of arts, theology, law and medicine.[27]

Curiously, during the same period Spanish America saw the flourishment of a large number of universities (and also of theological seminaries) which even though they were also very steeped in the classical scholastic education leading to the priesthood and the traditional "liberal" professions, were nevertheless less resistant than their Spanish counterparts to the scientific, philosophical and political ideological currents of the Enlightenment.[28] Indeed, as such, and particularly during the 18th century, the Spanish American universities and seminaries played a fundamental role in the formation of a liberal creole elite--a creole, incidentally who while becoming increasingly

richer and progressively influenced by liberal political and ecomomic ideals, continued to be blocked in their access to a colonial bureaucracy which on the other hand had gained increasing centralized control over the cabildos (town councils), that is, the creole's institutional base of political power--who during the beginning of the 19th century was to lead the Spanish American wars of independence.

Although by the end of the 18th century Puerto Rico did not have a university or a theological seminary, nor, as suggested before, any of the educational or cultural bodies which had sprung up elsewhere in the Spanish empire during the Bourbons' Enlightenment, the insular economic expansion of the period allowed the increasingly well-off local elites to send a greater number of their sons to do higher and professional studies abroad--mainly to Santo Domingo, Venezuela and Spain--where many of them came into contact with, and some were greatly influenced by, the liberal ideas of the time.[29] This was the case, for instance, of Ramón Power y Giralt, educated in the modern Institute of Vergara in Spain and later trained as a naval officer, and of Juan Alejo de Arizmendi, trained as a priest in Caracas, Venezuela, both of whom were to become during the 1810s the most outstanding liberal leaders of

the insular creole elite, the former as Puerto Rico's first representative to the revolutionary Spanish Cortes--of which more will be said in the next section--and the latter as the Island's first native bishop.[30] However, the fact that the local creole elite had to send their sons abroad to obtain their degrees in higher education certainly limited considerably the growth of the insular professional and intellectual sectors. Moreover, the overall economic and political weakness of the former as compared to its counterparts elsewhere in Spanish America is reflected in their failure to establish a degree-granting university or seminary on the Island despite of their efforts to do so particularly since the 1770s.[31] And indeed by the end of the 18th century the only secondary and higher studies available in Puerto Rico continued to be the Latin, theological and liberal art courses offered at the cathedral and the Dominican and Franciscan convents, while the only concession to the degree-seeking sectors of the insular elite was the authorization to the students in the Dominican and Franciscan convents to obtain degrees in philosophy and theology at the University of Santo Domingo in the neighboring Island of the Hispaniola.[32]

During the second half of the 18th century primary education in Spain became also an object of the increasing

intervention of the Crown. In the 1770s the licensing and the regulating powers of the guild of teachers--the Hermandad de San Casiano--were reduced and given to the Royal Council while the supervisory capacity of the Church was limited to the examination of teachers regarding their knowledge of the Catholic doctrine.[33] Moreover, during the subsequent two decades a series of measures were taken which furthered the intervention of the State in primary education: by a 1780 royal order, the Hermandad de San Casiano was superseded by the Colegio Academico del Noble Arte de Primeras Letras, Spain's first normal school for the training of elementary teachers; in 1791, this body was replaced by the Academia de Primeras Letras, which was more under the control of the government than the Colegio, and which in addition to functioning like a normal school, had the prerogatives of examining and appointing teachers; in 1804 a governmental examining board substituted the Academia while in 1806 the Crown ordered the establishment of regional educational boards throughout the kingdom; and in the same year, another normal school, the Real Instituto Militar Pestalozziano, was founded by the government and operated until the Napoleonic invasion in 1808.[34]

It is worth noting in this context that the name of this latter institute is very revealing of the great

influence that the Swiss educator Pestalozzi (1746-1827) had on Spanish educational reformers, an influence that can also be seen in the several schools that were established in Spain, particularly since the 1780s.[35] In Spain as in the rest of Europe and in America the books and educational methods of Pestalozzi gave a strong stimulus to the beginnings of the popular school movements of the period, and more specifically to the idea that the primary education of the children of the poor was a major factor in improving their socioeconomic conditions as well as improving the general productivity and the moral order of society.[36] Following Rousseau--who also exerted great influence over Spanish "enlightened" reformers--, Pestalozzi placed special emphasis in his pedagogy on the child's natural development and own activities (thus, his so-called "child-centered" pedagogy); but perhaps more appealing to the more influential educational reformers of the day was Pestalozzi's emphasis in an education not merely of the "mind" but also of the "heart" and the "hand", and hence in an education which combined intellectual learning with moral and manual (or industrial)training. More authoritarian and less concerned than Pestalozzi in the autonomous development of the child, the Bourbon reformers placed however as much importance as him in the moral and manual education of the poor classes.[37] On the whole, while both

Pestalozzi and the Spanish reformers might have sincerely believed that the socioeconomic conditions and status of the poor masses could be improved with popular education, they did not seek to break down with such education the hierarchical class structure of society nor even to stimulate individual upward social mobility. Rather, in their view, popular education would improve the lot of the poor classes as working classes, more specifically, as literate, productive and obedient classes, content with their status and place in society as producers (whether as peasants, artisans or wage-laborers).

Interestingly enough, the Spanish reformers also sought to prevent the use of primary education as a stepping stage for higher Latin and university education, hoping to check in this way the mobility of individuals from the productive occupations to the higher status bureaucratic positions and liberal professions.[38] Moreover, like their European and, later, North American counterparts, Spanish reformers were particularly concerned with the threat to the public order and to the nation's economic progress which in their view was presented by the growing poor urban masses, many of whom were considered idle, or were unskilled and excluded from the artisan guilds and, on the whole, at the margin of the influence and coercive

power of the Church and the State. Thus by providing these masses with moral and manual training, popular education was seen by the reformers as a major instrument for the achievement of social order as well as of industrial growth. Also, incidentally, it was seen as an instrument for breaking the restrictive monopoly of the artisan guilds (which had been a major target of the reforms of the Bourbons since the rule of Charles III) over industrial production and, specifically, over the apprenticeship systems which the guilds used, among other things, to limit the potential competition of new artisans and apprentices.[39] In all, during the last third of the 18th century there were from the part of the Crown and from such organizations as the Economic Societies important philantropic and paternalistic attempts to provide the lower urban masses with a highly moralistic and trade oriented education which included, for example, the creation in 1791 in Madrid of 8 royal schools for the poor and, more interestingly, the establishment of several schools for girls in which the major component of the curriculum was the catechism and needle-work and weaving.[40] Nonetheless, in spite of such attempts, it appears that the number of primary schools did not increase significantly and neither did those with a manual or industrial training component. And indeed it appears that while the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1767

gave the government and municipalities more control over education as well as more funds and facilities to sustain educational efforts, it nevertheless seriously hampered such efforts given that the competent Jesuit teachers could not be adequately replaced.[41]

And the same appears to have been true of the extension of primary education in most of America where the activities of the Jesuits had been quite extensive. But there was still much public primary educational activity in Spanish America, partly financed from the expropriated riches of the Jesuits, and partly from the resources of the increasingly richer cabildos; while at the same time the wealthier families were in a better position to provide private tutors to their children, a form of instruction which in fact many of these families preferred to that offered in the public schools.[42] Again, as compared to Spain and most of the rest of Spanish America, the growth of primary schooling lagged considerably in Puerto Rico during this period, and this was so despite of the relative expansion of the insular economy and of the increasing concerns in this respect of the Church, the colonial government and the municipalities (principally San Juan and San Germán which continued to be the largest urban concentrations of the Island). However, two relevant

developments are worth mentioning. One refers to the regulations regarding primary schools that were issued by the governor of Puerto Rico in 1770--Muesas--as part of his Directorio General, consisting the latter of a series of orders and regulations concerning the duties and responsibilities of the "tenientes a guerra" who were the deputies of the governor in each of the districts ("partidos") of the Island.[43] Among other things, the Directorio ordered the "tenientes" to ensure that each of the districts had at least one teacher of primary letters whose salary was to be collectively provided by the local parents; it also ordered parents to send at least half of their children (that is, sons) to primary school so that they could learn reading and writing; that teachers should receive in schools all non-slave boys sent there irrespective of their race; and that aside from reading, writing and counting, teachers should teach their students to obey their elders and their authorities, and to be "fearful of God and the King."[44] This last prescription fits particularly well with the general tone of the Directorio given that the latter had as one of its principal aims the enforcement of the authority of the Crown and more specifically, the prevention of the contraband trade.[45] In any case, it should be noted that these regulations were the first attempt by the insular colonial government to

make primary education compulsory (at least partially) and the first to provide for the integrated education of whites and free blacks and mulattos. But apart from their symbolic importance, these regulations did not mean much, for even if the "tenientes" were to attempt to fully implement them, something for which there is no evidence, it should remembered that the Directorio called in effect for only two teachers for the whole Island, that is, one teacher for each of the two districts ("partidos") into which the Island was divided,[46] a situation which needless to say would had made the compulsory prescriptions of the regulations quite unenforceable.

The other development of some significance was the efforts by the cabildo of San Juan to establish at the turn of the century (1799-1804) four schools for girls, each of which was to be headed by one female teacher. By 1804 at least three of the teachers had been appointed and though little is known regarding their subsequent activities, it appears that for some time they taught in their own homes such things as literacy, the cathechism and sewing to a few girls without receiving the salaries promised by the cabildo.[46] These were at any rate the first known attempts to provide primary schooling (whether private or public) for girls in Puerto Rico, while the teaching that was

offered, already anticipated the sex-gender orientation of the schooling that was to be available to women during the 19th century.

Taking into account the unprecedented grcwth of the insular economy during the last part of the 18th century, one could guess that aside from the primary schools founded in part or completely by the municipalities and the Church, there was some increase during the same period in the number of primary private schools or private tutors. However, there is no available evidence regarding the extent of such increase. Moreover, one should not forget that Puerto Rico was still very poor and that as yet, too few people could afford any form of private education. As to the advances in public education, whether for boys or for girls, the situation in San Juan in 1808 is very indicative of how meager were the actual achievements for the whole Island, for in that year the capital city had only two schools--probably each consisting of a room in the house of their respective teachers--that were supported by the cabildo.[47]

The Napoleonic Invasion, Constitutional Experiments, Wars of Independence, and Absolutist Reactions

In the first quarter of the 19th century Spain experienced a popular uprising that forced the abdication of the king, a war of national liberation against France, two short lived attempts to establish a liberal constitutional monarchy, and the lost of all of its American colonies with the exception of Cuba and Puerto Rico.[48] The disastrous foreign policies and wars pursued by Spain at the turn of the century during the reign of Charles IV (1788-1808) and his chief minister Godoy (1792-1808) not only reduced the peninsula to the status of a military satellite of France and cut her from its contacts with the American continent, but also plunged her into a deep depression which exploded in popular revolt in 1808 and led to the abdication of Charles IV in favor of his son Ferdinand. But this uprising only gave Napoleon, who since 1807 had placed a sizeable army in Spain, an excuse to intervene more directly in the affairs of the peninsula by forcing into exile both Charles IV and his son and by attempting to install in their place as king of Spain his brother Joseph Bonaparte. This attempt by Napoleon provoked, however, a remarkable popular armed reaction from the Spanish people who rose in mass against the French intruders and eventually drove them

out of the peninsula after a bitterly fought struggle that lasted until 1814.

A very important political creation and, at the same time, agency of such struggle was the central and provincial governing "juntas" (committees) set up to lead and organize the Spanish forces in the resistance.[49] In 1809 the coordinating "Junta Central" declared Puerto Rico and all other Spanish colonies integral provinces of the Spanish monarchy with the right of representation to the central government. This was followed in 1810 by a call from the "Junta Central" to all the provinces for the selection of representatives of an extraordinary "Cortes" (the traditional Spanish Parliament). The Puerto Rican creole elite welcomed enthusiastically the call for representation, sending as delegate the already mentioned liberal minded Power y Giralt who was to actively represent their interests in the Cortes.[50] Significantly, this political move of the Puerto Rican elite differed from the action taken by most of the creole elites in most of the Spanish colonies in the American continent. Instead of sending delegates to the Cortes, these took rapid steps toward complete autonomy and progressively developed a full fledged war of independence from Spanish rule. The struggle spread even further with the re-establishment of absolute monarchy in

Spain in 1814 and thus by 1825 all that remained of the Spanish empire was Cuba, Puerto Rico and the Phillipine Islands.[51]

The work of the Cortes between 1810 and 1814 is particularly important for they produced a number of politically liberal reforms including the famous Constitution of 1812, one of the most liberal constitutions at the time and one of the principal rallying points in both Spain and Puerto Rico of the emerging liberal bourgeois, professional and intellectual sectors.[52] The Cortes rejected royal absolutism and instead proclaimed the principle of national sovereignty in the form of a parliamentary monarchy. Though the constitution maintained a rather strong monarchy and centralized government--aspect which turned away many Spanish-American creole elites, it put however substantial restrictions on the monarchy and provided for an unicameral national legislature (the Cortes) with representation from all the provinces, including the American possessions which now were considered an integral part of Spain rather than as colonies. Moreover, it provided both the peninsular Spaniards and the Spanish Americans the same basic rights and liberties, including the right of suffrage to all free male 25 years and older born in any of the provinces, though it excluded those of African descendance--i.e. black and mulattos

(though these could obtain citizenship through special concessions from the Crown). At the local level, the constitution put restrictions on the power of provincial governors and provided for elected municipal governments and for a quasi-representative--partly appointed by the Crown and partly chosen through indirect elections--administrative council, the Provincial Deputation (Diputación Provincial) in charge of some important insular affairs.

Interestingly, in terms of its electoral provisions, the Constitution of 1812 was more democratic than those in effect in most of the Western world at the time, including those of England and the U.S.[53] For example, unlike the latter, it did not restrict suffrage in terms of property or educational requirements. Still, nonetheless, it suffered not only the limitations already noted--the exclusion from suffrage of females or of African descendants--but in addition, it restricted the eligibility for representation to the Cortes and to the Provincial Deputation to the propertied or well-to-do classes. It is worth pointing out, however, that the Cortes did not represent with equal force the interests of all the propertied and well-to-do sectors; rather, they represented well the interests of the relatively small (landed and

urban) bourgeoisie and secular intelligentsia while the landed interests of the aristocracy and the Church were undermined. They abolished the aristocratic seigneurial privileges and pressed for the selling of most of the lands in the hands of the Church.

In these, the Cortes continued with greater vigour the thrust of the land reforms initiated during the reigns of Charles III and Charles IV. The Cortes also followed the thrust of the Bourbons in the secularization of the political and cultural institutions even though Catholicism continued to be recognized as the official religion of the State. Thus the Inquisition was abolished while the power of the Church over formal education continued to be reduced by placing primary education in the hands of the State.[54] For this purpose the constitution provided for the establishment of elementary schools in all cities and villages of the nation with a uniform curriculum of reading, writing, arithmetic and catechism. The Provincial Deputations were charged accordingly with promoting and supervising these efforts. Though the constitutional government had in fact few resources and, most of all, little time to implement such measures, it is worth pointing out that these marked an important step in the struggle of the liberal forces in Spain to gain control over education through the mechanism of the State, a movement

which throughout the century would take the form of struggle between the State and the Catholic Church over the control of education.

But all these liberal-bourgeois and secular reforms soon generated a widespread opposition especially among the powerful conservative forces of the Catholic Church, the aristocracy, the military hierarchy and the civil bureaucracy of the old regime. And eventually, once the French troops were driven out of Spanish territory in 1814, the conservatives rallied around the returning heir to the throne, Ferdinand VII, who subsequently abolished the 1812 Constitution, dissolved the Cortes, restored absolute monarchy, re-established seigneural rights and returned to the Church the main responsibility for education. For Puerto Rico this meant a return to its previous colonial status and to the arbitrary rule of Spanish governors; the enlargement of the Spanish military presence as a result of the continental wars of independence and the immigration of a large number of conservative Spanish loyalists fleeing from these wars. As a result, such developments weakened considerably the position of the liberals within the insular creole elite.[55]

Moreover and ironically, their demands for political liberalism were further weakened by the rather successful

attempts of the Spanish monarchy--with the help of the able and efficient Alejandro Ramírez (1813-1816), intendent of the Island--to meet some of the economic demands of the creole elite. The constitutional government of 1812-1814, in spite of its liberal political reforms had not responded to the demands of the insular commercial landowners for the further liberalization of the mercantilistic trade policies. In 1815, Ferdinand VII issued a royal decree (Cédula de Gracias) which not only provided for such liberalization but also for other measures that were to stimulate the growth of the insular population and economy.[56] The Cédula provided, for example, for more freedom of trade between Puerto Rico and nations other than Spain, for the importation of tax-free sugar-processing machinery, for the settlement of Catholic entrepreneurs with their slaves, and for the granting of royal land to the newcomers. In part, as a result of the implementation of these provisions, which were to be in effect until 1830, the Island experienced throughout this period a rapid expansion of its population (which, as Table 1 shows, almost doubled between 1812 and 1830 rising from 183,014 to 325,835); of its commercial export agriculture (particularly from sugar, coffee, and, to a lesser degree, tobacco, which were to be throughout the 19th century its principal cash-export crops); and of its governmental revenues. In short, these

developments strengthened the economic position of the export-oriented landowning hacendados as well as of the export-import merchants and the state bureaucratic sector.

The same developments hardly benefited the majority of the rural masses.[57] On the one hand, the expansion of the sugar producing "haciendas" resulted in an increase in the demand for slave labor, an increase reflected, for example, in the growth of the slave population which doubled between 1812 and 1830 rising from 17,536 to 34,240 (see Table 1). On the other hand, the expansion of commercial export agriculture also resulted in the progressive coercive transformation of the great number of relatively independent subsistence farmers into servile "agregados" (sharecroppers or tenant farmers) or forced wage-laborers under the hacendados (e.g. in only 3 years, from 1824 to 1827 the number of "agregados" almost tripled from 14,327 to 38,906).[58] As shall be seen shortly, this encroachment by the hacendados over the independent subsistence farmers would gradually increase throughout the 19th century with the support of the colonial bureaucracy. It should also be mentioned in this context that such encroachment would do little to improve the agricultural skills of the peasant population which would continue to be, as they were when they lived as isolated, independent subsistence farmers, at

a rather very rudimentary level.[59]

In addition to the economic gains resulting from the 1815 Cédula, the creole elite obtained in 1820 with the re-establishment of the 1812 Constitution, some degree of political participation in the State apparatus, both at the metropolitan and insular levels.[60] This second constitutional government repeated most of the reforms of the previous 1812-1814 regime, extending again a provincial (rather than colonial) status to Puerto Rico with equal constitutional rights as the rest of the provinces in the Spanish peninsula. But this time the Cortes tried to undermine further than before the power of the Church, supressing many monastic orders, confiscating their lands and selling them to private interests (mostly to a growing landed bourgeoisie). Along the same lines, the Cortes attempted to reduce again the influence of the Church in education, trying--unsuccessfully--to reorganize the educational system at all its levels by declaring all educational institutions supported or authorized by the government to be free and uniform, and by proposing a central educational board that was to have full administration of all public education in Spain.[61]

In Puerto Rico such measures resulted in the closing of the Dominican and Franciscan monasteries which as seen

previously were at the time its only source of secondary and higher education.[62] According to the educational plan of the Cortes, the insular agency in charge of education was to be again the local Provincial Deputation. However, this body delegated much of its authority in educational matters to the local Sociedad Económica de Amigos del País (Economic Society of the Friends of the Country) founded in the 1810s by Intendent Ramírez, which as the ones already mentioned, sponsored by the Bourbon reformers, had the primary purpose of promoting the advancement of the local economy, popular primary education and the dissemination of economically and governmentally "useful" knowledge. With a membership consisting mainly of men from the wealthy propertied and professional classes, the local Economic Society was to share with the government and the Church throughout most the 19th century much of the responsibility for formal primary education on the Island, even though the Society's educational endeavors were largely limited to the establishment of secondary schools and of academic chairs in professional and advanced studies, facilities almost exclusively restricted to the sons of the insular creole and Spanish elites.[63]

Notwithstanding this, it is worth pointing out in this context that along with the colonial governor, Provincial

Deputation and the cabildo of San Juan, the Economic Society made also some attempts in the early 1820s to introduce in Puerto Rico the monitorial, Lancasterian system of instruction, an educational system introduced in Spain in 1818 and which had gained rapid popularity among European and U.S. educators, businessmen and industrialists after having had been developed at the turn of the century in England for the specific instruction of the masses of children of the urban poor.[64] The Lancasterian system was modeled after the structure and methods of large-scale factories, it was thus characterized by a strict authoritarian hierarchy designed to produce mass instruction in a cheap, efficient and effective manner. According to this system, one master teacher instructed several of the older or more advanced pupils--the so-called monitors--who in turn drilled or dictated prescribed lessons to a large number--occassionally several hundreds--of younger children assembled in one large classroom. It could be that, as educational historian Michael Katz noted with reference to the Lancasterian schools that were established in New York earlier in the century, the monitorial method provided the urban bourgeoisie with a cheap and efficient class system of education by which they could "civilize" the growing urban working masses and thereby ensure that society would remain tolerable, orderly and safe.[65]

> Aside from its miniscule cost per pupil, this mechanistic form of pedagogy, which reduced education to drill, seemed appropriate because the schools served lower-class children who could without offense be likened to unfinished products, needing to be inculcated with norms of docility, cleanliness, sobriety, and obedience.[66]

But it should be pointed out that in Puerto Rico the Lancasterian system was received with great enthusiasm not only by its embryonic bourgeoisie, but also by the colonial authorities; and, further, that the interest of the latter was not just in securing an orderly society for the benefit of the bourgeoisie or for capitalist production, but also for enhancing the power of the Spanish State over all sectors of the insular society. This can be seen, for instance, in the support given by the colonial governor--together with the Economic Society, the Provincial Deputation and the cabildo de San Juan--to the creation of a normal school for the training of teachers according to the Lancasterian method as well as the implementation of Tadeo de Rivera's plan (Instrucción metódica) for establishing schools throughout the Island that were to incorporate several aspects of such method. Thus, in supporting these projects the colonial governor indicated that their purpose was that children

> would learn to be good and virtuous Spaniards, useful for the State, and lastly, loyal followers of our sacred Code, which is the

> principal foundation of the general happiness of the nation.[67]

At any rate, despite the initial enthusiasm shown for both of these projects, neither was put into operation, partly because the colonial government, local bourgeoisie and upper classes could not generate enough funds to support them,[68] but also because the relatively small urban concentrations of the Island made the establishment of the large schools, which the Lancasterian method called for, rather irrelevant. Indeed, while throughout the rest of the century there was some growth in the urban centers and an increasing concern of the insular elites and colonial officials for the education of the working masses--commonly justified in terms of the latter's moral and technical instruction--, and while during the same period some aspects of the Lancasterian system were incorporated in the public schools of the Island, most of these schools remained small and personalistic, and for the most part circumscribed to the largest room of the teacher's house,[69] thus, far different from the large-scale, factory-like schools suggested by the Lacasterian system.

It should be noted that apart from their efforts to introduce the Lancasterian system in the Island during the early 1820s, both the Economic Society and the Provincial

Deputation had little time to implement the other previously mentioned educational reforms of the Spanish constitutional government of 1820, given that in 1824 Ferdinand VII established himself again as absolute monarch, abolishing in this way the Cortes, the 1812 Constitution, and many of the liberal measures of the constitutional regime.[70]

During his new absolutist reign, which was to last until his death in 1833, Ferdinand restored to the Catholic Church much of its previous authority over education, including its authority over the certification of primary and secondary teachers, and in both Spain and the remaining American colonies--Cuba and Puerto Rico--the Church and its monastic orders were allowed to reopen their schools.[71] Like the Economic Society, which during this period continued its educational activities, the endeavors of the Church were primarily concentrated on secondary education. In 1832, a Diocesan Seminary (Seminario Conciliar) was opened in San Juan by the bishop of the Island, an establishment that served both as a training institution for the secular priesthood and as a preparatory secondary school for professional and university studies.[72] Poor boys were accepted to the seminary with scholarships, but whether poor or more or less wealthy--in which case they had to pay a fee--all had to be at least 12 years old, to know the Catholic doctrine, reading and writing, and, moreover, to

be whites, of Spanish descendance and the sons of legitimate marriages. It should be advanced here that in subsequent years this institution was to provide preparatory secondary education for many of the creole professionals and intellectuals who in the second half of the 19th century were to play an active and major role in the politics and cultural life of the Island.

At the primary school level, there was some expansion during this period as the private economy and the revenues of the colony also expanded and as the insular government and the municipalities gradually assumed greater financial responsibility for primary education. Nevertheless, the expansion of primary education was still precarious if one considers for example that apart from some apparent growth in the number of private schools and tutors, there were in 1830 only 29 "official" schools that were supported (at least in part) by the insular government or the muncipalities.[73]

Continuous Turmoil in the Metropolis and Despotic Colonial Tranquility in Puerto Rico

The period between 1833 and 1874 was for Spain one of almost continuous political unrest and peninsular frag-

mentation, punctuated by civil wars, military "pronunciamientos" (i.e. uprisings and coups), and rapidly changing governmental ministries.[74] An important part of the unrest, particularly during the 1830s and 1840s, arose out of the struggle between a conservative Catholic Church and the emerging anticlerical bureaucratic, intellectual and (landed and urban) bourgeois sectors intent on stripping the Church of much of its tremendous wealth and power, including its authority over the State and the educational system. And in effect, in Spain the Church was stripped during the 1830s of much of its wealth and authority, found itself at war with a State controlled by those anticlerical forces, and had much of its landed property sold to an expanding commercial landowning class. By the 1850s, however, the dominant bureaucratic and military sectors controlling the State apparatus had re-established an alliance with the Catholic hierarchy--formalized through the 1851 Concordat with the Papacy--which resulted, among other things, in the prohibiton of other religions and in recognizing the Church's supervisory authority over the moral content of formal education.[75] This alliance marked, moreover, the culmination of a gradual process of entrenchment in Spain, despite the continuing social and political strife, of a wealthy landowning and urban bourgeoisie and a bureaucratic and military oligarchy which would rule

between 1833 and 1868 (as well as after 1874 into the 20th century) through the institutions of a parliamentary monarchy with a strong (at times dictatorial), centralized executive and military apparatus, and a highly elitist bicameral Cortes, with one house appointed by the Crown and the other elected through a suffrage basically restricted to the men of the wealthy and privileged classes.

One interesting development of this period was the 1857 Moyano law on public instruction which created the legal basis of a centralized university network and a uniform national system of primary schools, normal schools, institutions of secondary education and university faculties where financial support for higher education was entrusted to the central government in Madrid, that of secondary education to the provincial governments, and that of primary education to the municipalities.[76] With several subsequent amendments, this law was to remain in effect in Spain throughout the rest of the century. Altogether, however, the law had only a limited effect on the expansion of schooling, particularly of primary schooling, as public educational expenditures remained very small; and thus by the end of the 19th century Spain still had one of the lowest literacy rates (44 percent) in Europe.[77] In any event, the Moyano law was not extended to Puerto Rico until 1898, that is, during the brief

autonomous regime that Spain granted the Island shortly before it was lost to the U.S. in the Spanish American War.

Ironically, despite the scenario of political strife in the metropolis during the 1833-1868 period, the successive parliamentary monarchical governments like the previous absolutists governments managed to maintain in Puerto Rico up to the 1860s, a relatively "peaceful" regime through a repressive and extractive colonial policy implemented by a series of generally despotic and arbitrary military governors. And curiously, while the Church in Spain was at war against the parliamentary monarchy, in Puerto Rico it found a strong ally in the colonial government which shielded it from most of the anticlerical measures that were passed in the metropolis during the 1830s. In fact, throughout the rest of the century, except during the brief liberal and republican governments between 1869 and 1874, the Church would be a staunch supporter of the insular colonial authorities. Moreover, during most of the rest of the century the Catholic Church not only would be the official Church of the State but also would exercise substantial control over the press and education even though at the same time the State would gradually assume greater authority over the latter. Indeed, in such a position, the Church would defend very ener-

getically both its dogmatic scholastic philosophy and the colonial policies of the government from the liberal, rationalistic and heterodox (including Freemansonry and Spiritism) ideas which were spreading among the creole elite.[78] But before going too far into the century, it is appropriate to say a few words on the nature and implications of the colonial policy that Spain imposed on Puerto Rico between 1833 and 1868.

The colonial policy during this period facilitated the gradual imposition of mercantilistic tariff and fiscal measures which like the1815 Cédula allowed the Island to trade with nations other than Spain, but unlike the Cédula, placed increasingly higher custom barriers on such trade while at the same time it limited the exports of the Island to the Spanish peninsula.[79] The new mercantile policy was thus geared to give Spain's peninsular agricultural and industrial exports preferential treatment in Puerto Rico while protecting Spain's agricultural and industrial production from competition by articles produced in the Island. Besides making Puerto Rico a profitable reserved market for Spain's surplus, the mercantile tariffs and the fiscal measures which accompanied them generated substantial governmental revenues which financed the costs of the colonial administrative and military apparatus and helped

subsidize many non-insular expenses of the metropolitan government while only a minimum of these revenues were spent for insular public services and works--such as education, health and transportation. The rise in governmental revenues was due to the fact that in spite of all the obstacles that the mercantile policy placed on the insular economy, it did not prevent external trade with nations other than Spain. Gradually, though with great difficulties and occasional downturns, such trade expanded stimulating the growth of commercial export agriculture in Puerto Rico and in particular the growth of sugar production and to a lesser degree, of coffee and tobacco.

Curiously enough, an important result of this development was the increasing economic dependency of the Island on the U.S., both as a market for its agricultural staples, primarily sugar and molasses (e.g. by the middle of the century the U.S. absorbed between 42 and 55 percent of the Island's exports), as well as a major source of its imports, a fact that would trouble Spanish officials since the middle of the century fearing U.S. expansionism in the Caribbean and the possible loss of Puerto Rico (and its reserved market) to that country.[80] This fear would move the Spanish government to raise even further the custom barriers between Puerto Rico and the U.S., generating a

tariff war between the two metropolitan powers that resulted in new restrictions on the insular sugar exports to North American and creating thus a situation that eventually would push many creole hacendados--especially the sugar producing ones--and merchants dependent on the U.S. market toward political positions demanding not merely greater freedom of trade but also greater insular political autonomy or even as some of them would do, political independence from Spain.[81]

Interestingly, Spanish officials would also be troubled during this time by the growing number of Puerto Rican youth, mostly the sons of creole hacendados and businessmen linked to the expanding export-import trade to the U.S. who were traveling to the U.S. to pursue secondary and university studies, a trend which Spanish officials generally viewed as politically dangerous since they were afraid that among other things, those students would bring back to the Island such allegedly pernicious and anti-hispanic ideas and custums as republicanism or Protestanism.[82] Thus, partly in order to prevent Puerto Ricans from going to study in the U.S. the colonial government attempted some reforms and improvements in secondary and professional education of which more will be said below.

On the whole, Spain's blatantly colonial and mercantilistic policies in Puerto Rico had contradictory and ambiguous results and meanings for the local creole hacendados. On the one hand, throughout most of the 1823-1868 period they were deprived of political participation in the metropolis and the local government and had to suffer the burdens of a mercantile tariff and fiscal policy that was clearly unfavorable to their economic interests. Moreover, they had to contend locally with a class of large export-import merchants, mostly Spanish-born, who with the total support of the colonial State machinery were in control of marketing a large part of the hacendados' produce (especially that exported to Spain) and monopolized the credit facilities of the Island. The Spanish merchants took advantage of such a situation of dependency of the hacendados and many of these found themselves increasingly in debt to the former.[83]

Even so, in spite of their difficulties, it must be remembered that during this period commercial export agriculture gradually expanded, generally improving the economic position of the hacendados and extending their control over larger tracts of land and over a greater number of peasant laborers and slaves. In this process, moreover, the hacendados got the support of the colonial government

in meeting their needs for a dependent labor supply. Such support came first through the legal maintenance of black slavery and secondly through the legal coercion of non-slave peasants and laborers. It was difficult for the hacendados in the expanding commercial agricultural sector to persuade the large population of free subsistence peasants and small farmers to work for them as wage laborers. On the other hand, though slavery was not abolished until 1873, increasing legal restrictions of the slave trade made slave labor an ever more expensive and unreliable source of labor supply for the sugar producing hacendados.[84] Thus, in response to the combined demands for labor of both the sugar producing hacendados and those hacendados producing other commercial export cast crops (e.g. coffee and tobacco), the colonial authorities enacted a series of measures deisgned to transform the relatively independent subsistence peasants and small farmers into landless and/or market-dependent peasants who could be forced to enter into subordinate wage-labor, "agregados" (tenant or share-cropping) agreements with the hacendados. Such measures included evictions laws, direct State taxes, anti-vagrancy laws and work-book passes ("régimen de las libretas"), of which the most infamous were the Bando de Policía y Buen Gobierno of 1838 and the Reglamento de Jornaleros of 1849.[85] Another infamous measure of this

epoch was the Black Code (Código Negro) of 1848, a provision which followed a series of abortive slave revolts and which subjected both free and slave individuals of color to judgement by court martials.[86]

Moreover, to counter the persistent resistance of peasants and slaves to such repressive measures, and to protect the interest of the hacendados, the colonial authorities organized in the 1860s a repressive local police, la Guardia Rural (later joined by the infamous Spanish Guardia Civil).[87]

Eventually, however, with the increase in the landless peasant population and the restrictions of the slave trade, a growing number of hacendados began supporting both the abolition of slavery and the work-book system.[88] In this, they followed the lead of an articulate and expanding group of professionals and intellectuals, many of them also hacendados or the sons of hacendados, who had studied in colleges and universities in Europe and the U.S. and who to a large extent were imbued with the liberal ideas of the epoch.[89] Accordingly, a number of hacendados became gradually persuaded of the economic benefits that could result from the implementation of the liberal capitalist notion of contractual free labor, that is, State-unregulated labor, be it in terms of wage-labor arrangements or tenant

or sharecropping ones. Apparently, the metropolitan government had been inclined to support the abolition of both slavery and the work-book system during the 1860s, but resistance from local conservative hacendados, merchants and bureaucrats delayed such measure until 1873-1874, the period of the first Spanish republican government. This important period and the events leading to it will be examined shortly. Before, it would be convenient to catch up with the developments in formal education between 1833 and 1868.

During this period the colonial government increased considerably its control over primary education and made major attempts to promote its expansion, but it is important to have in mind that these attempts were made in such a way as to maintain in large measure the Catholic Church's influence over the school curriculum.[90] In 1834 a royal decree which reorganized the administration of elementary education in Spain was applied to Puerto Rico. It provided for the creation of school commissions at the provincial (insular), district and town, level that were supposed to supervise and encourage the establishment of primary schools; also, it provided for a special commission of teachers appointed by the provincial commission which was expected to hold teacher's examinations.[91]

In 1849 a board of examiners (composed basically of the provincial commission) was created to pass on teachers applications and certifications, and in 1851 a Royal Academy of Belle Lettres (La Real Academia de Buenas Letras) was created which incorporated the functions of the provincial commission and the teachers examining board in addition to being charged with promoting the development of general culture and the fine arts.[92] Under these series of measures, poor children were to be admitted free of charge in schools but only if the municipalities agreed to pay their fees. Moreover, access to public primary education improved for girls with these measures, with the establishment of separate schools for them.

For all, the expansion of governmental supported primary education was slow during this period and it was still practically limited to the urban areas. Though the number of public schools increased from 29 in 1830 to 122 (74 for boys and 48 for girls) in 1864, there were by this latter date only 3,488 students (of which 1,092 were girls and 2,010 were classified as poor)[93] out of a population which had increased from 325,838 in 1830 to 583,181 in 1860 (see Table 1). The generally slow development of primary education is reflected in the fact that by 1860 the illiteracy rate for the total insular population was as high as 91.2 percent.[94] When the illiteracy rate for this

year is broken down in sex-gender (89.6 percent for males and 92.9 percent for women) and racial categories (85.0 percent for whites and 97.7 for non-whites), the figures reveal interestingly considerably higher racial than sexist bias in literacy education. In a sense, this racial bias in education reminds one of the contemporary situation in the U.S. though certainly in this case the illiteracy rate was much lower for all groups; thus in 1870, for example, while the illiteracy rate of the U.S. population over 10 years of age was 20 percent, that for whites was 12 percent, and for non-whites was 80 percent.[95] Otherwise, the situation in Puerto Rico was not much different on the whole from that of Spain which in 1860 still had an illiteracy rate of around 76 percent.[96] Nevertheless, it should also be mentioned at this juncture that the illiteracy rate in Cuba, the other but more prosperous Spanish Caribbean colony was 80.8 percent in 1871,[97] that is not merely better thant that of Puerto Rico but indeed very close to that of Spain.

In any event, between 1864 and 1869 there was in Puerto Rico a sharp increase in the number of public primary schools from 122 to 313--and in the number of students--from 3,488 to 8,129 (see Table 2). The number of public primary schools for girls and the girls in schools

also incrased, though at a much lower rate than the corresponding figures for boys; the schools for boys increased from 74 to 240 while those for girls from 48 to 67, while the number of schoolboys increased from 2,396 to 6,192, schoolgirls increased from 1,092 to 1,937 (see Table 2). To a large extent these increases were the result of the implementation of Governor Messina's Decree of 1865, the first systematic organic school law and plan put into operation in Puerto Rico.[98] The decree organized public primary education under the administration and supervision of a central Superior Board of Public Instruction (substituting the Royal Academy of Belles Lettras) and local boards in the municipalities. The local juntas were in charge of the administration and supervision of the school of each municipality, and each municipality was in charge of establishing and supporting its own schools; a responsibility which included the provision of school equipment, teachers' salaries and teachers' house rents (teachers' houses, by the way, constituted for the most part the school facility). The decree centralized the appointment of public school teachers in the hands of the insular governor, it also gave him the only authority to approve the appointment of teachers in private schools or those giving private lessons. It provided, moreover, for the establishment of a normal school; a provision which, however, was never implemented.

Indeed, no normal school was established in the Island until the 1890s. Otherwise, the decree divided primary education into two levels, elementary and superior: the first, for children from six to nine years, was made compulsory but free to all those who could not pay. Schools continued to be separated for boys and girls, and though both types of schools shared the traditional basic curriculum of catechism, reading, writing and arithmetic, other aspects of the curriculum were differentiated along sex-gender lines: for example, the curriculum for boys included elementary courses in agriculture, industry, commerce, geometry, mechanical drawing and surveying, and physical and natural sciences, while that for girls included designing, embroidery and domestic science.[99] The decree also divided the schools racially, providing for the establishment of special schools for non-white children where particular attention was to be given to the moral and religious instruction of the pupils.[100]

It is worth pointing out that the educational reforms introduced by the 1865 decree took place in a decade characterized, as shall be elaborated below, by widespread political and economic unrest in Puerto Rico, Spain and the rest of the Caribbean. In Puerto Rico, in particular, this decade was marked by a series of highly repressive

governors intent on persecuting liberal leaders and in "pacifying" the restless peasant and slave populations. In fact, the educational reforms of 1865 might be seen as one central aspect of such governmental policies. The educational aim apparently was, as Osuna puts it, "to manufacture a certain culture submissive to the policies of the mother country, to make loyal subjects of Spain."[101] Interestingly, though the 1865 decree resulted in the educational expansion already noted, it also generated widespread opposition and resistance from municipal governments and from among the teachers.[102] The opposition of the municipalities was expressed in their frequent demands for the reduction of teachers' salaries, by refusing to pay teachers' house rents, and by interfering in the latter's appointments. Apparently, this opposition was supported by various sectors represented in the municipal governments: the small and medium-scale hacendados merchants who could not afford to pay for such educational efforts due to their continuing economic problems; large-scale hacendados who feared that the extension of formal education to peasants would make agricultural wage labor less attractive to these,[103] and liberal professionals and intelectuals who though favoring the generalization of public education to the popular masses resented the intrusion of a repressive central insular government in the affairs of the municipa-

lities.[104] Teachers, on the other hand, had additional special reasons to oppose the decree, perhaps one of the most important being that most of them did not meet certain of the academic qualifications (i.e. normal school preparation) required by the decree on account of which they were to be payed only half of the salary assigned to the regular teaching positions and exposed to possible replacement by other teachers (mainly Spaniards) who met the requirements. It can be seen from these developments that primary education was becoming a central political sphere of controversy between the creole elites and the colonial government, an arena of struggle which in subsequent years would also involve other sectors of society.

As regards to higher education, it should be noted that the aspirations and demands of the insular elite for the establishment of university or post-secondary college in Puerto Rico continued to be frustrated during this period, though the wealthiest among them continued to send their sons to Europe, South America and the U.S., to pursue such education. Nevertheless, the colonial government made some important attempts during this period to comply with some of their demands.[105] This was done in part, as indicated above, to prevent Puerto Ricans from

going to countries where they could be "contaminated" by ideas contrary to Spanish monarchical and Catholic norms. Thus, colonial authorities promoted the establishment of several academic chairs and examining boards in advanced and professional fields such as law, pharmacy, geography, architecture and botany. At the secondary level, the colonial government continued to give financial support to the efforts of the Economic Society and the Diocesan Seminary (Seminario Conciliar). In 1843 both of these agencies combined their academic classes while in 1851 a royal order authorized the Seminary to grant a bachelor of arts degree equivalent to those conferred in Spain at the time upon completion of secondary education and which qualified its graduates for admittance in Spanish universities. In 1858, on the other hand, another royal order put the Jesuits in charge of all secondary education in the Island and authorized them to transform the Seminary into a college of secondary education with a curriculum similar to those of analogous official and State supported institutions in Spain. From then until 1882, except for a few months during the republican government in Spain in 1873-1874, the Jesuits were in official control of secondary education in Puerto Rico. The Jesuits, which had been reinstated in Spain with the favor of the Spanish government shortly before their arrival to Puerto Rico, were to

become among the leaders of the conservative religious and political forces both in Spain and the Island, a position that was reflected in their orientation and teaching in the college-seminary with its elitist enrollment and program of studies and their strict and authoritarian methods. Nonetheless, they provided the sons of the wealthy classes of the Island a high quality university preparatory education with a variety of introductory professional, commercial and technical subjects.[106]

It is appropriate to note that besides the secondary college that the Jesuits operated in San Juan (which later moved to Santurce, a San Juan's neighborhood) there were other private schools, lay and Catholic, that generally offered both primary and secondary education. Little is known, however, of the precise number and enrollment of these institutions apart from the fact that like the Jesuit College and before this, the Diocesan Seminary, they served mainly as university and professional preparatory schools for the sons of the local elite. The Jesuit College supervised the secondary curriculum of these intitutions and was in charge of granting the official degrees (Bachelors in Arts) for the secondary education provided by them. From 1858 to 1878 it granted 221 of such degrees and had an average enrollment of around 140 students,[107] a

small number indeed if one considers that in 1867, for example, the total population of the Island was around 650,000 while the total number of students was around 10,000,[108] but apparently, large enough to meet to a substantial degree the demands for secondary education of the local elite. In time, the Jesuits' control over secondary education would be increasingly contended by a growing liberal creole elite, mainly by its intelligentsia, who were intent not only in gaining ideological hegemony on the Island but also in having access to the teaching positions monopolized by the Jesuits and by the other religious orders.[109]

From the "Grito de Lares" to the Autonomist Regime

The 1860s was a period of intensive political unrest and economic problems for Spain, both in the peninsula and in its Caribbean colonies.[110] In Puerto Rico the antagonisms between the liberal elite, on the one hand, and on the other the Spanish colonial officials and large merchants escalated even more. On top of the growing frustrations of the insular elite with the colonial mercantile tariffs and taxes, an increasing number of its members became involved in the local slavery abolition movement which received some stimulus from the abolitionist thrust of the U.S. Civil War

(1861-1865).[111] The insular elite was furthered troubled by the efforts of Spain between 1861-1868 to re-establish colonial domination over neighboring Santo Domingo, financing such efforts with revenues extracted from Puerto Rico. Moreover, the growth of the abolitionist movement and the failure of Spain in Santo Domingo gave impetus to a small group of local hacendados and professionals who advocated political independence for Puerto Rico. Amid the growing political unrest and economic problems, the colonial governors intensified political repression, especially against the abolitionist and separatist leaders and, as was noted before, against the rural peasant population. This would lead in 1868 to a small-scale, unsucessful armed uprising--known as the "Grito de Lares"--led by a handful of separist hacendados and professionals with the backing of a small group of landless peasants.[112] This uprising was rapidly overwhelmed by the Spanish forces, but it was followed closely by a revolt in Spain (and also by a rebellion in Cuba that would last from 1868 to 1878) which initiated in the peninsula a brief and unstable period (1869-1874) of liberal governments that gradually extended to the Island many of the liberal reforms demanded by the majority of creole hacendados, merchants, professionals and intellectuals. During this time, the political regime in Spain moved from a liberal centralist parliamentary

monarchy to a decentralized federal democratic republic and as this happened, the Puerto Rican elites gained the institutional means for greater participation in the insular government.[113] Thus, again the local elites were allowed representation in the Spanish Cortes as well as in the re-established Provincial Deputation, but now with a larger number of deputies in these political bodies which had now more powers than ever before. They also gained participation in elected municipal governments which during this period gained greater autonomy from the central insular government--including greater autonomy regarding educational matters. Suffrage was extended to a larger sector of the population: for example, in 1873 it included all males 21 years and over who paid taxes or who could read and write. However, it should be recalled that given the low level of literacy of the insular population (e.g. between 1860 and 1887, as shown in Table 2, the level of literacy rose only from 8.8 percent to 13.8 percent of the total population). This measure enfranchized only about 20,000 electors out of a population which at the time was around 700,000.[114]

In 1873 the work-book system and slavery were abolished (though the freed slaves were forced to do paid work with their former masters until 1876, while their political rights were not recognized until 1878). In that same year,

TABLE 2

Literacy Rates by Gender, Color, and Urban-Rural Residence

For Puerto Rico, 1860-1930

(In Percentages)*

YEAR	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	WHITE	NONWHITE	URBAN	RURAL
1860	8.6	10.4	7.1	15.0	2.3	N.A.	N.A.
1887	13.8	15.6	12.1	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
1899	22.7	25.7	19.9	27.1	15.6	N.A.	N.A.
1910	33.5	37.7	29.3	36.7	27.2	60.3	25.8
1920	45.0	49.3	40.9	46.9	39.9	66.0	38.4
1930	58.6	63.0	54.3	58.6	54.3	72.6	52.8

N.A.: Not Available

* For the years 1860 and 1887, the percentages are for that portion of the total population who could read; for the 1899-1930 figures, the percentages are for that portion of the population 10 years old and over, who could read and write.

Sources: U.S. War Department (1900a)
U.S. Bureau of the Census (1910-1940)

freedom of the press was established and soon there flourished a number of newspapers--including a few by several artisan groups such as the one that published in 1874 El Artesano, perhaps the oldest of its kind--as well as a lively public debate between the emerging conservative and liberal newspapers. Freedom of religion and the right of free association were also established allowing for the organization of numerous groupings with a wide variety of purposes, including Protestant Freemason groups, workers asociations, and political parties. In fact, this right allowed for the formation during this period of the first two political parties in Puerto Rico which grouped the main elite social forces that would dominate public debate on the Island until the end of the 1890s: the Liberal Reformist Party, later the Autonomist Party, supported primarily by creole hacendados, merchants, professionals and intellectuals; and the Conservative Party, or Unconditional Spanish Party, advocate of the insular colonial status and supported basically by Spanish-born colonial bureaucrats and large merchants.[115] At first, the Liberal Reformist Party had two factions: the "asimilistas" who wanted to end Puerto Rico's colonial status by making it an integral part of Spain where the Islanders would enjoy all the rights and privileges of Spanish citizens; and the "autonomistas" who urged not only full participation of

the Island in the Spanish Cortes but also substantial political and economic autonomy at the insular level as well as a large degree of municipal autonomy vis-a-vis the central insular government. The latter faction would succeed in 1887 in changing the name of the party to the Autonomist Party.

Between 1869 and 1874, the Liberal Reformist Party controlled Puerto Rico's representation to the Spanish Cortes as well as most of the Island's municipalities and the Provincial Deputation. Its leadership had thereby an active participation in the political reforms that were implemented during this period. One of course must have in perspective that in such endeavors they had the collaboration of the liberal governments in the metropolis and of the most liberal governors that ever were appointed to Puerto Rico under Spanish rule. They were also favored by the armed insurrection that was taking place in Cuba which appears to have moved Spanish officials to make concessions to the Puerto Rican leadership in order to prevent it from following the path of its Cuban counterparts.

This general situation provided the context for the increasing degree of control that the Puerto Rican elites obtained over primary and secondary education during this period. With the establishment of the Republic in Spain in

1873, the school systems of all its provinces, including Puerto Rico, were decentralized, a measure which meant almost full autonomy in public primary educational matters for the elected municipalities[116] which, as a matter of fact, were largely in the hands of the Puerto Rican elites and its supporters. In addition to this, the insular elites with the support of the liberal governor at the time succeeded in establishing in 1873 the Instituto Civil de Segunda Enseñanza (Civil Institute of Secondary Education), a degree-granting (B.A.), university-preparatory institution finantially supported by the Provincial Deputation which in addition to providing secondary education, had control over all other insular secondary institutions, being in charge of accrediting and supervising them.[117] This gave the insular liberal forces significant control over secondary education both indirectly through the Provincial Deputation, and directly by controlling the administrative and faculty positions in the Institute, a gain for the liberals that was of course made at the expense of the Jesuits who until then were in control of such institution.

But this situation was to last very briefly, for the Spanish Republican fell in 1874 and a series of conservative authoritarian governors were subsequently appointed to the Island--the most infamous and despotic being Sanz

(1874-1875) and Palacios (1887)--and with these changes the local liberal elite lost its political and educational ascendancy.[118] In all, the insular elites and its governmental allies had not only little time--scarcely one year--but also scarce economic resources to implement the above described educational reforms at the primary and secondary level, for not only did the Spanish metropolitan government continued during the Republican period (1873-1874) to limit the economic growth of the Island by maintaining its extractive mercantile policy but also it used most of the tariff revenues that were generated in Puerto Rico by virtue of the application of this policy to finance the costs of the war in Cuba. Little revenues were thus left available for the central insular and municipal governments to support the expansion of formal education.

The period between 1874 and 1898 is characterized by the restoration in Spain of an oligarchic centralized parliamentary monarchy which until 1890 limited suffrage to males who paid high property taxes or who were members of such influential groups as priests, generals and retired officers, holders of professional or academic diplomas and high level State bureaucrats. In 1890 universal male suffrage was established but within a political framework that had been marked since the restoration by a form of controlled elections in which local political bosses, known

as "caciques" manipulated local electoral politics for the benefit of the various oligarchs that headed the two major political parties that ruled Spain during this period. While maintaining this oligarchic and manipulative structure, the regime gradually restored some of the liberal measures obtained between 1869-1874: for example, apart from male universal suffrage, it re-established freedom of the press (1883) and the right of trade unions to associate (1887). The Catholic Church, however, was recognized again as the official State religion, and its authority to supervise the curricula of public and private schools was restored.[119]

From this power structure, there followed a colonial policy which ensured the Spanish-born conservative elite in Puerto Rico--composed mainly of high level government bureaucrats and large export-import merchants--of its political and economic hegemony. Formally, the insular liberal and creole leadership was allowed to maintain their political party as well as to participate in elections for municipal authorities and for representation in the Provincial Assembly and the Spanish Cortes, but this was done in such a way as to greatly reduce their possibilities of having any significant electoral representation or control of such bodies. The electorate was sharply limited by electoral laws similar in many ways to those applied in

Spain except that they were far more restrictive--for example, there was a tax requirement on local landowners which was five times higher than that imposed on their counterparts in Spain--thus limiting considerably the electoral base of the Liberal Reformist (later Autonomist) Party. Moreover, the colonial authorities systematically controlled elections in favor of the conservative Spanish Unconditional Party--dominated by the Spanish-born colonial bureaucracy and large export-import merchants--through a well established patronage and "cacique" system which meant like in Spain, the electoral manipulation of the popular masses by local bosses. On top of this, since 1874 to the early 1890s, the colonial governors often subjected the liberal and creole leaders to political persecutions, censoring their presses and jailing and exiling them. This situation of political repression reached its climax in 1887 as the autonomist forces grew among the local creole hacendados and merchants, founding in that year the Autonomist Party and spreading a boicot movement ("la Boicotera") against the large Spanish merchants which had been gaining force during the 1880s. These developments brought in 1887 the reprisals of the then governor Palacios, who closed the liberal press, threw a number of liberal leaders to jail, and tortured and in some instances executed them.[120]

Among other things, these repressive measures served as an effective mechanism for enforcing Spain's colonial mercantile policy in Puerto Rico, a policy which now became even more protective of Spanish peninsular landed, industrial and merchant interests as well as of those of the insular Spanish born merchant class. At the same time, these measures were even more extractive and limiting of the economic interests of most sectors of the local population including its most affluent groups. The mercantile policy, however, affected in different degrees local economic interests.[121] Among the hacendados involved in commercial export agriculture, the most affected were the sugar producers who suffered a sharp decline in production from the 1880s to the end of the century, a decline accelerated by the escalating tariff war between Spain and the U.S.--the major importer of Puerto Rico's sugar--,by the tariffs imposed by Spain to protect its own sugar industry, by the growing competition of the European beet sugar industry, and by the chronic scarcity of capital and credit facilities. Coffee growers, on the other hand, continued to suffer like sugar producers from the high tariffs on non-Spanish imports and from the high interest rates from local Spanish-merchant leaders, but unlike sugar producers, they experienced in the last two decades of the century a period of continuous rapid expansion favored by

secured Spanish, European and Cuban markets. Mainly as a result of these developments, coffee replaced sugar as the chief export product and source of revenue of the Island. Thus by the end of the century, coffee production accounted for 66.6 percent of the Island's total exports in value and 41 percent of the cultivated land while sugar production accounted for 21.8 percent of export sales and 15 percent of the cultivated land.[122]

In fact, the coffee boom was the major factor during the last decade of the century in the overall expansion of medium and large-scale commercial export agriculture at the expense of small farmers and small independent subsistence peasants. Between 1862 and 1899 the percent of cultivated land in the Island devoted to export crops increased from 51.3 to 68.4.[123] This was accompanied by the concentration of land in the hands of large hacendados: thus, for instance, by 1898 small or independent subsistence producers in farms under 10 cuerdas (1 cuerda = 0.9712 acres) operated 76.2 of all farms on the Island while they controlled only 20.5 percent of the total cultivated land; large hacendados, on the other hand, who owned farms of over 100 cuerdas controlled only 2.2 percent of the land but 35.9 percent of all cultivated area.[124]

Most of the haciendas were operated by their owners,

but it is worth emphasizing that the expansion of commercial export agriculture and the increased concentration of land during this period intensified the process of tranformation of independent small farm owners and subsistence farmers into dependent agregados, sharecroppers or wage-laborers in the medium and large-scale estates under the personalized control of the hacendados. Apparently, this process was particularly intensive in the interior and western mountain regions of Puerto Rico where most of the coffee production was concentrated. Indeed, apart from the labor obtained through the displacement of local small farmers and independent subsistence farmers, the expansion of coffee production in this area attracted many workers from the coastal regions particularly from the areas where the declining sugar producing haciendas were located. As a result, though there was during this period a generalized growth of the insular population--from 731,648 in 1877 to 953,243 in 1899--the increase in the coffee growing region was higher than on most of the rest of the Island, creating a sort of regional relative overpopulation which secured for coffee hacendados a cheap and dependent labor while subjecting the peasants and farmworkers to increasing misery, dependency and subordination.[125]

Interestingly enough, the decline of the sugar industry during this period, together with the aboliton of slavery,

contributed to the rapid increase in population of the principal urban centers as large numbers of landless black and white wage workers migrated to the cities in search of better life and job opportunities.[126] This growth provided the basis for the development in the urban centers of an artisan sector which though small in number--by 1898 it accounted for only between 5 and 7 percent of the working population--became ever more organized and politically articulated throughout the last decades of the century.[127] But the growth of the urban population also meant the growth of the few manufacturing industries that were being established during this period--principally the large-scale cigar factories established in the 1890s, a development which in fact undermined the economic power of the tobacco-related artisan groups.

Despite the growth of urban centers during this period, urbanization was still minimal; moreover, apart from the few manufacturing establishments in the urban centers and the few sugar (and molasses and rum) refineries in the counrtyside, industrial development was practically non-existent on the Island. At this time, the overwhelming majority of the population (85.4 percent) was still rural and involved in agricultural or related activities (62.8 percent of persons in gainful occupations) while only a

small minority (8.4 percent) was involved in so called manufacturing and technical industries most of which were composed of artisan and home manufacturing occupations--such as dress makers and seamstresses--which amounted for almost 7 percent out of the total 8.4 percent of the category.[128] Indeed, by 1899 there were more servants and launderers (13.6 percent of the persons in gainful occupations) than those categorized in the manufacturing and technical industries.[129] It is convenient to remember that this very rudimentary development of the industrial manufacturing sector is understandable in the light of Spain's mercantile policy of protecting its own industries while leaving the Island unprotected from incoming foreign manufacturers.

The data on servants and launderers just quoted are particularly interesting in that they also shed some light on the sex-gender differentiated character of the structure of the labor market in Puerto Rico by the end of the 19th century. According to the 1899 census, women engaged in the occupational categories of servants and launderers accounted not only for 81 percent of the total of workers in these categories but also for 74 percent of all women employed in Puerto Rico.[130] Moreover, if those engaged as servants and launderers are added to those engaged in other occupations classified within the general

category of "domestic and personal services" and those classified as dressmakers and seamstresses one finds that almost 91 percent of all women in the so-called "gainful" occupations were employed in home or domestic related jobs. In the 1899 census, women accounted for only 15.1 percent of all those in gainful occupations; more specifically, they accounted for 24.1 percent of the workers in occupations classified as manufacturing and mechanical industries (of these, 19.3 percent were the already indicated dressmakers and seamstresses), 14.2 percent of those in professional services, 7.2 percent of those in trade and transportation and 0.9 percent of those in agricultural related jobs.

It seems, however, that the latter figure on agricultural related jobs underestimates to a significant degree the number of women that were actually involved in work apart from those tasks traditionally assigned to wives and mothers. Though not much is known at the moment, the evidence tends to support the notion that a far greater number of women were involved in agricultural related jobs than those reported in the 1899 census as well as in other documents on the latter half of the 19th century.[131] It is known, for example, that in both small commercial and subsistance farms, the labor regime was based primarily

upon family work in which women were actively involved. Thus if one considers that by 1899 there were at least 29,744 of such farms (that is, farms of less than 10 cuerdas)[132] one might expect that in a great number of them women were in one way or another engaged in agricultural work. In addition to this, it is known that while women scarcely participated in agricultural work in the sugar haciendas, they participated in large number on the large coffee haciendas, especially during harvest time.[133]

In this context it is also worth pointing out that in those occupations classified within the professional services category there were by 1899 a trend in the participation of women that would be characteristic of the 20th century. In 1899 practically all the women classified within this category were either teachers or nurses, that is, 246 and 64 respectively out of a total of 311 women in the category.[134] Though in the 20th century women would also participate in large number in other occupations within this category, the occupations of teacher and nurse would overwhelmingly prevail among professional women. Of course, it must be considered that as small the number of both male and female professionals was in 1899 (0.7 percent of all gainful occupations), much smaller was the number of females in the professions, constituting only 14.2 percent of all individuals classified within this category.[135]

Yet, by this time women constituted 30.4 percent of all persons classified as teachers (246 women out of a total of 809) and 39.8 percent of all those actually teaching (248 women out of a total of 623); on the other hand, they constituted 50.4 percent of all classified in the nursing professions (64 women out of a total of 127).[136] Thus, though still few in absolute terms, this incorporation of women in the teaching (almost exclusively at the elementary level) and nursing professions indicates the existence at the end of the 19th century of a trend that will be more evident during the 20th century, clearly characterized by the expansion of the professional occupational opportunities of women but where the expansion was mostly concentrated in those occupations that were to a large extent an extension of the type of work women traditionally did in the home and which, from a patriarchal point of view, were considered more appropriate for them. As will be shown below, this gender differentiation was also evident in the schooling that was available for women during the last quarter of the 19th century, although it should be advanced here that despite the sexism implied by such gender differentiation, school opportunities for women increased to some extent during this period, providing accordingly the basis for some corresponding increase in female literacy as well as for the increase in the number of

female teachers. More on this later.

There was also some improvement in the social position of the non-white population of the Island during the last quarter of the century. Of course, the most notable development in this regard was the abolition of slavery in 1873 which marked for sure a substantial improvement in social status and civil rights not only for the freed slaves (especially after 1876, when the disposition which bonded them to forced paid labor with their ex-masters ceased to be in effect) but also for the already large population of free blacks and mullattos whose social status had been previously undermined by the condition of slavery of their African brothers and sisters, and whose civil and political rights had been continuously threatened by anti-black and anti-abolitionist measures like the already mentioned Black Code. Ironically, given the discipline and skills which they were forced to learn as slaves, many of the freed slaves were given mill and artisan jobs in the sugar plantations which as compared to the cane cutting and carrying jobs usually given to free laborers, were relatively privilege positions in the work hierarchy of the plantation.[137] On the other hand, blacks and mullattos continued to have a large participation in the urban artisan groupings and indeed by the end of the 19th century they had assumed apparently a leading position in the artisan

organizations of the period.[138] Moreover, while non-whites continued to be denied access to many government posts, to businesses and to the Church hierarchy, they were allowed some limited access to the teaching occupations and to the independent professions of law and medicine, some of whom became very prominent in the Island's party politics. The best known case being that of Jose C. Barbosa, a doctor of medicine trained in the U.S., who became one of the leading figures of the Autonomist Party and, subsequently after the U.S. occupation in 1898, the maximum leader of the insular Republican Party. As shall be seen below, the increased participation of blacks and mullattos in the artisan classes and their increased participation in the professional classes was closely related to a corresponding increase in their schooling and in their literacy rates. But this increased participation of non-whites in schooling and in the professional classes was not easy, for racial prejudice continued to be rampant, as the case of Barbosa also shows.[139]

It is worth noting that though Puerto Rico was still throughout the 19th century a highly racially mixed society which continued to be characterized by a high degree of racial intermarriage or miscegenation--principally among the free peasant and laboring classes--after 1820, and at a more rapid pace after the abolition of slavery in 1873,

its population began to "whiten" according to census figures. Thus, as can be derived from Table 1 (in Chapter II) in 1830, 49.8 percent of the population was white, about 48.8 percent was so in 1846, and 61.8 percent in 1899. To some extent, this "whitening" of the population reflected the continuous arrival to the Island during this period of white immigrants from Spain and other European regions (e.g. Italy, Corsica) while at the same time the growth of the black population was being slowed down by the decrease of the slave trade and, subsequently, the abolition of slavery. However, it is possible too that, as has been suggested by some analysts of these developments, the census figures underestimate the real percentage of the population of mixed racial background,[140] an underestimation attributed in part to the tendency of many Puerto Ricans to deny, hide or desguise the darker hues of their social origin. Whether this suggestion and explanation is true or not--for some it is very plausible even in contemporary Puerto Rico--the truth is that despite of the social improvements of the non-white groups during the second half of the 19th century, blacks and mullattos continued to be discriminated in most spheres of social life, and the social status of any person continued to greatly depend on how white or dark was the color of his or her skin.

Turning back now to the developments in the sphere of formal schooling in Puerto Rico right after the fall of the Spanish Republic in 1874, it should first be mentioned that the militar governor that was appointed to the Island following that event--the despotic Laureano Sanz--enacted a series of measures which highly centralized the school system under his authority in an attempt to secure in this way the unconditional loyalty of teachers and students to the Spanish government and its local colonial authorities.[141] At the primary school level for example, Sanz pursued a campaign of replacing local teachers, most of whom were thought to be radicals and autonomists, with loyal Spaniards. For this he put in full execution the 1865 educational decree which required of teachers normal school preparation, a requirement which in practice disqualified most local teachers. Many of these were to be replaced by better paid teachers brought from Spain. In time, it became evident that the policy of importing Spanish teachers was impractical and local teachers were again allowed to compete for public school positions but at least until the late 1870s they were markedly discriminated against in their appointments and pay in comparison to Spanish teachers. Sanz also intervened in the private lay schools, placing all of these under the immediate supervision of the insular government and local committees of public instruction and

requiring the permission of the governor for their establishment. Moreover, Sanz also required of these schools as well as public ones, the strict use of text books sanctioned by the government. With respect to secondary education, Sanz closed in 1874 the recently established Civil Institute of Secondary Education which enjoyed much favor among the liberal sectors among its members.[142] At the same time, he proceeded to restore to the Jesuits their previous control over secondary education.

Understandably, all these measures, in combination with other politically repressive ones, generated a great deal of resentment among the liberal sectors of the country, especially among creole teachers, intellectuals and professionals. But in the early 1880s, though still amidst a repressive and manipulative colonial framework, a number of governmental measures began to be implemented which addressed some of the complaints of local teachers and more broadly, of creole professionals and intellectuals. In 1880 a new organic school law was decreed which while centralizing even more the administrative and supervisory functions of the school system, provided nevertheless for better job opportunities, pay and security for local teachers.[143] The decree provided for the training of teachers in Puerto Rico, and eventually in 1891 two normal schools would be established, one for men and one for women.

The regulations regarding the establishment of private schools were liberalized as well as the certification requirements for teachers in these schools. In terms of organization and curriculum, the 1880 decree made few changes with respect to the 1865 decree but it differed from this, for example, in that it attempted to make elementary education (primary schools were still divided into elementary and superior), compulsory for children six to twelve years of age and provided for the establishment of special schools in rural areas and small hamlets. Indeed, with respect to rural education there was scarcely anything done as a result of this provision, but the provision in itself reflects a growing concern of the colonial authorities with securing ideological and moral control over a rural population much of which had been recently freed either from the regiment of forced labor of the work-book system or from slavery. Interestingly, a similar concern with disciplining the rural population through education was manifested by the liberal creole elite, though in arguing for rural schooling the latter would insist that such education would also improve the productive skills and the rational and democratic capacities of the peasantry.

At any rate, despite the 1880 decree and in spite of some noticeable increases in the primary school enrollments

in the years immediately following its enactment, the expansion of public primary schooling, according to the available statistics which are summarized in Table 3, seems to have been almost nil during the last decade of Spanish rule. And in all, by 1899, only 9.2 percent of the 5 to 14 year old population was attending schools in Puerto Rico, a figure which compares very unfavorably even with the 18.6 percent that did so in Cuba.[144] On the other hand, though between 1860 and 1899 there was an unprecedented increase in the rate of literacy of the whole insular population, that is, from 8.8 percent to 16.6 percent, this latter figure was much lower than the corresponding one for Cuba in 1899--36.1 percent--or for Spain which by 1887 had reached 32 percent.[145] Certainly, more dramatic is a comparison with the U.S. which in 1900 had a literacy rate for persons ten years and over of 89 percent, while Puerto Rico had in 1899 a corresponding one of only 22.7 percent.[146]

Of some interest is the fact that, of the 524 public primary schools reported in Puerto Rico in 1898, 227 were rural schools,[147] a datum which reflects to some extent the efforts of the government to extend primary education to the rural areas; this, however, must be put in perspective given that this figure represented only 43.3 percent of the total number of public schools, while the rural

TABLE 3

Public Primary Schools and Enrollment, by Gender

For Puerto Rico, 1864-1898

YEAR	PUBLIC SCHOOLS			ENROLLMENT		
	for Boys	for Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total
1864	74	48	122	2,396	1,092	3,488
1867	240	56	296	7,543	1,929	9,472
1869	246	67	313	6,192	1,937	8,129
1878	238	91	329	7,523	3,474	10,997
1880	328	104	432	10,736	4,482	15,218
1881	372	112	484	18,025	6,092	24,120
1886	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	18,194	7,195	25,389
1896	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	16,821	8,794	25,615
1898	384	140	524	16,801	8,754	25,555

Sources: 1. Coll y Toste (1970:138)
2. Clark (1900:40)
3. Carroll (1899:646-649)

population constituted around 85 percent of the total population.[148] It is also interesting to note here that of the 227 rural schools only 5 were for girls; in other words, by the end of the century there was little official concern to provide primary education for rural women. Yet, as shown in Table 3, the enrollment of girls in primary public schools increased slightly faster than that of men between 1878 and 1898 (152 percent and 123 percent respectively)--an almost entirely urban phenomenom--to constitute in 1898 around 34 percent of all children enrolled. On the other hand, sex-differentiated access to primary schooling is reflected in the rate of literacy as shown in Table 2; thus by 1899 only 19.9 percent of all women 10 years and over could read and write compared to 25.7 percent for men, but again these figures also reflect some improvement in the rate of literacy of women.

Table 2 also shows some improvement in the rate of literacy of non-whites, in part attributed to the already noticed improvement in their social situation after the abolition of slavery in 1873, though when compared to that of whites, it still reflects a sharp racial bias in formal education. On the other hand, it appears that much of the literacy among blacks and mulattos was concentrated among those who belong to the urban artisan, working groupings. As mentioned before, a large part of

the artisan classes were blacks or mulattos; moreover, as it would be seen below, literacy was relatively very high among the urban artisans due not only to their probable access to the few urban primary schools but also to the education which they sponsored for themselves.

With respect to secondary and post-secondary education, one can also note some important developments since 1880, aside from the already mentioned normal schools established in 1891. Perhaps most important was the re-opening in 1882 of the government-supported Civil Institute of Secondary Education which became not only the most important secondary (university-preparatory) school in Puerto Rico during that period but also the agency officially in charge of accrediting and supervising all private secondary schools in the Island as well as accrediting all secondary studies done at home under private tutors.[149] Moreover, it was the only institution which could grant degrees (B.A.'s) in secondary education. Such prerogatives and the generally strong support it had from the liberal sectors of Puerto Rico, brought the Civil Institute into direct conflict with the conservative Jesuits who until now had been in charge of secondary education in the Island. Indeed, as a result of this conflict and the lost of government subsidies, the Jesuits closed their secondary college-seminary and withdrew from Puerto Rico in 1886.

The Civil Institute catered principally to the sons of the insular wealthy elite, but though it required for example the payment of fees for entrance examination, for registration, for the examinations in each of the subjects and for the B.A. degrees or its other diplomas, a small number of poor students were also admitted and given free tuition. Pupils generally entered the Institute when they were between 10 and 12 years old, after being examined in the subjects which according to the 1880 organic decree were taught in the primary schools, a policy which gave access to the Institute to those students that were taught by private tutors. The main program of studies was of 4 years, and consisted of a basically humanistic, liberal arts, university preparatory program even though it was rather modernized with an important component of the natural-physical sciences; thus aside from the languages (Latin, Spanish, English and French), philosophy, mathematics and history, it included geography, physics, chemistry, natural history and theoretical agriculture. Moreover, later it began to incorporate a second, technical and commercial curriculum for which it granted diplomas and which included such courses as business arithmetics, bookkeeping, commercial geography, statistics, political economy, applied chemistry, industrial mechanics and drawing. However, this second curriculum apparently did

not attract many of the students of the Institute as these apparently were more concerned with pursuing the higher status courses which were preparatory for the university, and hence for the liberal and literary professions.

The Civil Institute continued to be in charge of secondary education in the country until 1898, but though the school itself enjoyed much popularity among the local elites during the 1880s its enrollment declined in the 1890s in part because its liberal professors were subjected to political persecution, and sometimes fired from their positions. Thus, even though the liberal insular sectors had in a way prevailed over the Jesuits it seems that the Spanish colonial regime and Spanish-born professors still held much control over the Civil Institute and, through this, over secondary education in Puerto Rico. The decline in enrollment of the Civil Institute was partly compensated by an increase in enrollment in private secondary education but it should be noted that the average enrollment between 1883 to 1898 of all the secondary schools recognized by the Civil Institute was only around 316 students. That is, about 1.2 percent of the number of students (25,555) enrolled in public primary education in 1898.[150] Apparently, there were other secondary students in private schools not recognized by the Civil Institute--like, for example, the government supported College of the Mothers of

the Sacred Heart established in 1880 for girls of wealthy families and apparently the only institution, aside from the normal school for women, providing the latter formal secondary education until the end of the century.[151] In all, secondary schools remained not only elitist and basically university oriented institutions but also almost exclusively male oriented.

It is necessary to note in this context that aside from these elite university preparatory institutions and apart from the normal schools for teachers, there were also some efforts on the part of the insular government, the municipality of San Juan and/or private societies and individuals to establish arts and trade schools or educational institutions specifically catering to the working classes. For example, in 1883 the Professional School was established in San Juan for the preparation of surveyors, builders, machine engineers and commercial and mechanical experts as well as for the teaching of such trades as carpentry, typography, masonary, and tobacco-elaborators. Apparently, because of lack of funds--which it received from the Provincial Deputation--the school was closed in 1888, though some of its courses were incorporated in the technical curriculum at the Civil Institute.[152] In 1888, a group of citizens of San Juan founded the Institución Libre de Enseñanza Popular (the Free Institute of Popular

Education) which until 1898 offered to the workingmen of the capital tuition-free night classes in reading, writing, mathematics and drawing (e.g., industrial drawing and graphic arts) with the support of their own private funds and the occasional help of the Provincial Deputation and the city's municipal council. It seems that in particular the drawing classes of this institution became very popular for it has been reported that between 1895 and 1897 they had an average of 110 students.[153] On the other hand, since 1896, San Juan's workingmen were offered in this or another establishment of the city--perhaps the School of Arts and Trades, though the available information is not clear about this--"popular lectures" ("enseñanza popular") in such topics as political economy, popular law, practical ethics and geography of Puerto Rico.[154] Plans for the School of Arts and Trades had been approved by the Provincial Deputation in 1895, but the new school, which was conceived as an elaborate extension of the trade workshops that had been offered for some time in an orphan and insane asylum in San Juan and which when finally established consisted of well supplied workshops in, among other things, carpentry, typesetting, bookbinding and mechanics, did not begin to operate until the beginning of 1898 and then for only a few months, since the school was closed for good when the U.S. occupied the Island in that

same year.[155] However, during its few months of operation the school had an attendance of 312[156] students which, along with the large attendance at the Institución Libre, show the great interest that San Juan's workingmen apparently had in these technical and trade schools and courses, an interest that was also shared--though perhaps for different reasons--by some bourgeois and professional members of the insular elite.

Indeed, the latter's concern reflects to some extent the influence of the contemporary manual training and vocational school movements in Europe and particularly the U.S., a movement which in turn reminds one of the concerns of the Bourbon reformers during the previous century: in both cases there was a certain philanthropic-paternalistic attitude toward the poor working classes which saw popular manual and trade education as the way to uplift morally, culturally and materially the poor, to raise their productivity, and of preventing them from falling into idleness and delinquency. There was also in both cases a liberal economic and industrialist interest in breaking down the monopolistic power of the artisan guilds and trade unions which the former regarded not only as technically outmoded but also restrictive in the provision of cheap labor since the guilds or trade unions generally tried to keep or filter out of their apprentice-

ship systems a large part of a growing number of the young members of the working classes. On the other hand, the working classes, including its artisan sectors, generally supported the movements for popular trade and vocational education, though not always for the same reasons as those given by the liberal bourgeoisie and professionals, and at times suspicious of the hierarchical, class segregated character of some of the forms of vocational and trade training advocated by the latter. In Puerto Rico, for instance, such concerns can be detected in the testimony of the leaders of the different artisan guilds of San Juan to H. Carroll, special U.S. commissioner to the Island in 1898.[157] In emphasizing the convenience of establishing art and trade schools, these artisans conceived them not as narrow vocational schools for the training of specific trades but in a broader sense as schools which combined theory and practice, as well as general and trade education. In this broad conception of the arts and trade schools the artisans were only reaffirming a rationalistic tradition, derived in great measure from both the Enlightenment and the subsequent liberal and working class movements, and which they increasingly articulated along with a mix of populist, socialist, co-operativist and anarchist propositions--particularly since the 1870s when artisan organizations (e.g. associations of mutual aid),

newspapers, social centers ("casinos") and cultural activities (e.g., night classes, conferences, literary discussions) began to proliferate in the Island.[158] It should be noted that this organizing and cultural drive, together with the strong possibility that as predominantly urban groupings,the artisans might have been among the chief beneficiaries of whatever growth there was in public primary education, made them among the highest literate groups in Puerto Rico. Accordingly, while the general literacy of the Island in 1899 was 22.7 percent, two of the largest groups of artisans, the carpenters and the tobacco elaborators, had literacy rates of 68.4 and 59.7 percent respectively, while smaller groups had even higher ones, such as the typegraphers with 100 percent and the tailors with 87.5 percent.[159] However, despite of such cultural drive and of the rationalist and broad social concerns of the artisans in advocating the art and trade schools, it appears that there were other motivations involved in their advocacy. In this respect, it is worth noting that one of the major complaints of the artisans to commissioner Carroll was that their trades were overcrowded, that there were too many workmen, too much competition among tradesmen and artisans, and too much competition from working class children 15 year old or less;[160] thus while it is not said so explicitly, it appears that to these and many other

artisans, the art and trade schooling was not only a way for the general enlightenment and technical training of the working class children but also a way of removing some of these from competition, at least for some time, with those who were already artisans or skilled workers, a position frequently taken by trade unions then and now.

With respect to university education, two developments should be noted. In 1880, members of the local elites founded the organization "Sociedad Protectora de la Inteligencia" (the Society for the Protection of the Intelligence), which until the end of the century provided financial resources for a number of students to secure formal education especially higher education, in either Europe or the U.S.[161] And in 1888, after a number of efforts by the same local elites, especially after the insistent pressures of the professional and intellectual liberal sectors, there was established an Institution of Higher Studies in the Ateneo of Puerto Rico, an elite private society which since its foundation in 1876 had been promoting cultural and scientific activities.[162] The Institution of Higher Studies was the first center established in the Island with a full university program; it was supposed to function, however, as an extension of the University of Habana which was to appoint a committee from among its faculty to examine the Puerto Rican students

either in Cuba or in Puerto Rico. The traveling expenses were to be payed by the government of Puerto Rico. Soon, however, these and other expenses appeared to be too costly and the institution was discontinued after only two years of operation. While in operation, its program of studies followed in general lines the program of many contemporary European and North American universities. It consisted, for example, of four faculties: philosophy letters, science, law and medicine. Thus like its European and North American counterparts, it had what often has been referred to as a classical liberal-humanistic program of studies. But it would be an error to see this program solely or mainly oriented toward the so-called "non-utilitarian" or "non-practical" moral and cultural formation of future elite members of society for though such could have been one of its primary objectives, it is clear that another principal objective was the vocational training of students for the most popular of the so-called liberal and intellectual professions.[163] For these same reasons, the wealthy families of the Island had sent their children abroad for university studies and were to continue to do so after the Institution for Higher Studies of the Ateneo was discontinued in 1890.

As in the case of secondary education, university education remained basically the privilege of a very small

minority. This is reflected, for example, in the data reported in the 1899 census according to which only 1.9 percent of the 15 to 17 year old population was attending schools while only 0.5 percent of the total population had some form of formal education over primary schooling.[164] As would be expected, the proportion for women was much lower, as they constituted 28.8 percent of the 1.9 percent figure for the 15 to 17 year old population and 27.5 percent of the 0.5 percent population with formal education over primary schools.[165]

In this context, it is appropriate to have in perspective that even in the most industrialized and liberal democratic countries, attendance in secondary and post-secondary education was done by only a relatively privileged few. In the U.S., for example, only 7.9 percent of the high-school age population (14 to 17 years) was attending school, while only 4 percent of the 18-21 year old population was attending college or university.[166] This is certainly much higher than the roughly corresponding figures for Puerto Rico--1.9 percent for the 15 to 17 year old population and 0.04 percent for the population 18 years and over[167]--but it nonetheless shows that even in such an economically prosperous and liberal democratic society, secondary and post-secondary education were mostly elite oriented forms of education.

The 19th Century Epilogue: The Brief Autonomist Regime

In April 1898 the U.S. declared war on Spain, in July, U.S. troops began the occupation of Puerto Rico and by August they had taken control over the Island. Just a few months before, in November 1897, the Spanish government had granted Puerto Rico a Charter of Autonomy, a concession conferred to the local creole elite amidst the war of independence launched against Spain by the Cubans in 1895.[168] The Charter retained the right of representation of Puerto Rico in the Spanish Cortes while providing an insular bicameral parliament empowered to legislate on local matters, to provide for the Island's budget and revenue, to frame tariffs and fix customs duties on export and imports, to ratify or reject commercial treaties between Spain and other countries affecting Puerto Rico, and, with the approval of the Spanish government, to negotiate commercial treaties with foreign governments. The legislature was composed of a partially elected Council of Administration in which 7 of its 15 members were to be named by the governor-general, and of an elected House of Representatives. The municipalities were declared autonomous in local matters, including among those areas, legislation and budgeting concerning public primary education. The Charter also provided universal suffrage

for males over twenty-five years of age. The official head of the insular government, the governor-general, was to be appointed by the Spanish Crown. He was the representative of the Spanish government in the Island and exercised broad powers in such areas as the armed forces, the maintenance of law and order and the enforcement of royal measures. He also had executive power on local civil and political matters, but such power he had to share with a cabinet, consisting of one president and 5 ministers (secretaries), who were to be appointed by the governor-general and who could be dismissed by him, though they were responsible to the local parliament and had to authorize the executive interventions of the governor-general.

It is worth pointing out here that one of the cabinet level ministries provided by the Charter was the Secretary of Public Education, though a few months later, as the ministries were reduced to four, the Secretary of Public Instruction was placed under the Secretary of Fomento Interior which had also responsibilities in public works, agriculture and commerce. In any event, it is not clear from this constitution or from the laws that immediately followed, what were the precise prerogatives and division of labor between the central ministry, which was advised by a consultative body of 36 members, and on the one hand, the Provincial Deputation (an elective, administrative body

which stood between the ministry and the municipalities and which, among other things, had autonomous responsibilities in the establishment and financing of educational institutions) and on the other, the municipalities. In relation to this, it should be noted that the Charter of Autonomy also extended to the Island the already mentioned Spanish public school law of 1857 (the Moyano law), still in effect, which gave the insular central government (in this case, the ministry and the Provincial Deputation) and the municipalities, substantial autonomy over educational matters, the former over secondary, professional and higher education and teacher certification, and the latter over primary instruction.

In all, the 1897 Charter of Autonomy granted the Island not only more political, economic and educational autonomy that ever before under Spanish rule but also, in many respects, more autonomy that it ever would achieve under U.S. domination after 1898. This is particularly true in those areas regarding customs and international trade. The Charter also provided for a measure of muncipal autonomy which it would never achieve subsequently in the Island. Nevertheless, it is necessary to remember first that while the autonomous constitution limited the authority of the governor-general it still provided this office with ample colonial and executive powers; second, that

women were still excluded from participation in political life while being subordinated to patriarchal family and socioeconomic structures; and third, that though the Charter provided for universal male suffrage it yet allowed for a highly hierarchical economic and social structure which facilitated the political and cultural manipulation of an ever more powerful elite of hacendados, merchants, professionals and intellectuals.

In any event, the government organized under the Charter of Autonomy was in operation for only a few months. Its first cabinet was appointed in February of 1898, by April Spain and the U.S. were at war, in July this nation invaded Puerto Rico, and between July and August it established full military control over the Island. Thus the end of Spanish rule came with the abortion of its major attempt in political, economic and cultural autonomy. There was accordingly little time to formulate and initiate any educational reform or program. Certainly, the 1897 Charter provided the liberal sector of the insular elites with ample autonomous authority over the educational system. Moreover, it provided them with the decentralized educational administrative framework that they had traditionally demanded. But beyond this general framework one can only speculate on the concrete direction that the liberal creole elite would have given to the educational

system had they been more time in power. It is convenient to recall, for example, that in the last decades of the 19th century, liberals had been in continuous conflict with the Catholic Church, especially in their struggles for the control of secondary education, for the establishment of the principle of freedom of thought, and for the replacement of the traditional scholastic philosophy and pedagogical methods of the Catholic or Catholic-influenced schools by their "modern", rationalistic and scientific ones. However, whether they might have pressed for the further secularization of the State or the public school system is open to question, considering that with few exceptions liberals in Puerto Rico were never as fiercely anti-clerical as their counterparts in Spain, and that to pursue such secularization would have required a change in the Spanish constitution and laws, and hence the political success of the more radical liberal forces in the metropolis.

On the other hand, the extension of public primary education to the laboring classes had also been a long-standing goal of the insular liberal elites, indeed more so of their professional and intellectual members than of their landowning ones. This interest, as has been suggested earlier, reflected a variety of concerns. For example, liberals often insisted on the fundamental function of public education in preparing the laboring masses for their

role as politically-enlightened citizens, capable of exercizing suffrage and of participating in democratic self-government. They also insisted on the key role of public primary and technical education in improving the socio-economic and moral conditions of the laboring classes and particularly of the overwhelming rural masses. Some radical liberals like Eugenio María de Hostos, for instance, saw the extension of a free and universal public school system as providing one of the main avenues for the establishment of an egalitarian and democratic society with hierarchies based only on the personal efforts, talents or merits of its members.[170] Thus he came close to the modern meritocratic idea implied in the notion of "equal educational opportunity" which proposes that an universal and free school system would contribute to a large extent to an open society where one's position in the social division of labor is determined mainly by one's personal merits and efforts rather than by one's inherited status.

However, it must be recalled that often the rationalistic, meritocratic and egalitarian intentions of the liberals were expressed as part of a broader liberal democratic capitalist ideology which reflected not merely an elitist bias in the meritocratic sense, but also a class-hierarchical bias. Thus for the liberals, primary

and technical education was to be extended not merely to prepare laborers as democratic citizens or to make them more skilled and productive workers, but also to make them law-abiding and to improve their work discipline, their moral character, their respect for private property and for wage-contract obligations.[171] Indeed, like educational reformers in the most industrialized capitalist countries--notably the U.S., as shall be seen in the next Chapter, liberals in Puerto Rico often insisted more on the need to improve the moral character and discipline of laborers than on improving their agricultural and industrial skills. Even a radical liberal like Hostos, while advocating for progressive, rationalistic and scientific pedagogical methods, emphasized the importance of disciplining the character of the young by means of military education.[172]

The class bias of the Puerto Rican elites is also reflected in their demands regarding secondary, professional and university education. It must be recalled that with few exceptions--namely, liberals like Hostos, Salvador Brau and Manuel Zeno Gandía--most landowners and professionals traditionally insisted more on the establishment of secondary and higher educational institutions than of the expansion of public primary education. Considering the poverty of the Island and its large

illiterate and unschooled population, such insistance on the part of the creole elite could have resulted not only in the establishment of a highly elitist educational structure but also in limiting even further the already scarce material resources that were available for primary education. Moreover, even if the autonomous regime had resulted in a more prosperous economy for the Island, and provided accordingly greater municipal revenues, it appears that there was among some sectors of the local elite, namely among the large landowners who controlled in great part the municipal governments and budgets, certain reluctance in supporting the extension of primary schooling to the rural masses, fearing--perhaps correctly--that such education would drive rural laborers away from the exploitative and deadening work in the coffee haciendas or sugar plantations, and encourage their migration to the towns in search of better living conditions and of higher status clerical jobs.[173]

On the other hand, it should be advanced here--as shall be elaborated in the next Chapter--that by the end of the century, there was an articulate sector of the insular elite that had been much influenced by the dominant thought and practices of the U.S., not only in political, economic and organizational matters but also in educational ones. Ironically, after its military occupation of the Island in

1898, the U.S. would try to foster the rapid expansion of the insular public educational system along North American lines, but it would do so within the framework of a highly centralized colonial structure designed to consolidate its political, economic and cultural hegemony over the whole Puerto Rican people, including, thus, over the latter's elite sectors.

FOOTNOTES

[1]The main sources of general history on Spain and its American colonies during the reigns of the Bourbons in the 18th century that were used in this study are Altamira (1930), Haring (1963), Herr (1969,1974), Payne (1973,Vol.II), Stein (1970), Vicens Vives (1959,1967), Vicens Vives et al (1972, Vol. IV), and Vilar (1967). Specially useful among these were Herr (1969) and Vicens Vives et al (1972, Vol. IV). The sources for Puerto Rico are: Brau (1966a), Caro Costas (1980), Fernández Méndez (1975,1976), Figueroa (1968), Gutiérrez del Arroyo (1953), López (1974a), Morales Carrión (1974,1980), Ortíz (1983), Silén (1973), Tapia y Rivera (1945), Torres Ramírez (1968), and Steward et al (1956).

[2]On the "enlightened depostism" of the Spanish Bourbons see in particular Herr (1969) and Vicens Vives et al (1972, Vol. IV); also Vicens Vives (1959:425-434).

[3]Illustrative of the latter were the many government censuses and reports on the demographic, administrative and socioeconomic conditions of Spain and its colonies that were proposed or commissioned by the Bourbons; a case in point being the previously mentioned report made by O'Reylly in 1765 on the demographic, socioeconomic, governmental and military conditions of Puerto Rico. See Vicens Vives et al (1972, Vol. IV:227-228).

[4]On the "regalism" of the Spanish Bourbons and on their conflict with the Catholic Church, see Herr (1969:11-36) and Vicens Vives et al (1972, Vol. IV:215-234).

[5]See Stein (1970:94-104), Vicens Vives et al (1972, Vol. IV:158-178, 380-392); also Haring (1963:314-325), Morales Carrión (1974:83-99).

[6]Torres Ramírez (1968:86-91), Vicens Vives et al (1972, Vol. IV:170-177). Another establishment that played an important part in stimulating Puerto Rico's legal export-import trade was La Factoría which was set up in 1785 to organize the export of tobacco and other insular commodities to Holland; see Torres Ramírez (1968:94-105).

[7]Stein (1970:97), Vicens Vives et al (1972, Vol IV:176-177).

[8]It failed however in its attempts to capture Puerto Rico in 1797.

[9]Morales Carrión (1974:118-126), Vicens Vives et al (1972, Vol. IV:178).

[10]Morales Carrión (1974:121-122).

[11]Herr (1969:86-119), Vicens Vives et al (1972, Vol. IV: 12-24, 292-309).

[12]Fernández Méndez (1975:171-177), Torres Ramírez (1968: 31-49).

[13]Fernández Méndez (1976:309).

[14]Fernández Méndez (1975:168-169).

[15]Morales Carrión (1974:90).

[16]Torres Ramírez (1968:91-93).

[17]Morales Carrión (1974:91).

[18]Morales Carrión (1974:126).

[19]Figueroa (1968:141-150), Morales Carrión (1974:87-96, 1980:229-243), Torres Ramírez (1968).

[20]Morales Carrión (1974:96).

[21]Cruz Monclova (1965:26-28).

[22]Cruz Monclova (1965:18), Hostos (1966:411), Pedreira (1969:33-34), Vicens Vives et al (1972, Vol. IV:400-401).

[23]Herr (1969:154-159), Haring (1963:222-223), Vicens Vives (1959:431-434).

[24]Altamira (1930:170-172), Herr (1969:154-200), Payne (1973, Vol. II:365), Vicens Vives (1959:431-434), Vicens Vives et al (1972, Vol. IV:228-229).

[25]Vicens Vives et al (1972, Vol. IV:398).

[26]A product of the expedition to the Island was the very informative memoirs of a French botanist, Ledru (1957), a member of the expedition.

[27]Herr (1969:163-172), Payne (1973, Vol. II:365).

[28]Lanning (1940:61-68), Vicens Vives et al (1972, Vol. IV:397-402).

[29]Cuesta Mendoza (1937:163-175), Gutiérrez del Arroyo (1953).

[30]Cruz Monclova (1965:19-31).

[31]Cuesta Mendoza (1937:150-161), Osuna (1949:18), Torres Ramírez (1968:141-144).

[32]Cuesta Mendoza (1937:149), Hostos (1966:360), Torres Ramírez (1968:143-144).

[33]Kagan (1974:17), Vicens Vives et al (1972, Vol. IV: 223).

[34]Cossío (1915:20-24).

[35]Altamira (1930:170,178), Cossio (1915:23-24).

[36]Curti (1978:99).

[37]This is perhaps most evident in the writings of one of the most prominent Bourbon ministers, Rodríguez Campomanes, and in the "popular education" sponsored by the Societies of Friends of the Country. See Herr (1969:50-51, 154-157), Vicens Vives et al (1972, Vol. IV:97-98).

[38]Kagan (1974:47).

[39]Herr (1969:124-126), Vicens Vives et al (1972, Vol. IV:95-99).

[40]Cossío (1915:21-22), Herr (1969:126,157), Osuna (1949: 14-15).

[41]Kagan (1974:22).

[42]Vicens Vives et al (1972, Vol. IV:396).

[43]Partially reproduced in Caro Costas (1980:485-494).

[44]Caro Costas (1980:488-489).

[45]It appears that Muesas had planned to divide Puerto Rico into 5 districts ("partidos"), but he did not succeed

in accomplishing this and thus, even though he was instrumental in the foundation of a number of towns during his governorship, the Island continued with just 2 "partidos"--San Juan and San Germán--until the 19th century. But even if Muesas had succeeded in establishing those partidos, this would have meant, according to the Directorio, the appointment of only 5 teachers. Both Cuesta Mendoza (1936:102) and Osuna (1949:17) refer incorrectly to the existence at the time of 22 "partidos", that would have required, according to the Directorio the appointment of 22 teachers.

[46]Osuna (1949:19-20).

[47]Cruz Monclova (1965:16).

[48]The main sources of general history on 19th century Spain used here are: Altamira (1930), Artola (1975), Herr (1974), Payne (1973, Vol. II), Vicens Vives (1959, 1967), Vicens Vives et al (1972, Vol. V), and Vilar (1967). On Puerto Rico, the main sources are: Brau (1966a), Cruz Monclova (1965, 1966, 1920, 1971), Fernández Méndez (1975), Figueroa (1970), García Ochoa (1982), Gutiérrez del Arroyo (1953), López (1974b), Silén (1973), and Steward et al (1956).

[49]Artola (1975:9-15), Herr (1974:70-72), Payne (1973, Vol. II:424-425).

[50]Cruz Monclova (1965:3-49), Figueroa (1970:25-28); López (1974b:43-44).

[51]See Halperin Dongui (1969:74-133).

[52]Artola (1975:29-37), Herr (1974:72-76), Payne (1973, Vol. II:424-427), Vicens Vives et al (1972, Vol. V:288-289).

[53]Payne (1973, Vol. II:426); also Herr (1974:74).

[54]Artola (1975:277-279) Cossío (1915:25-27), Osuna (1949: 20-22).

[55]Cruz Monclova (1965:68-69), López (1974b:45,50).

[56]On the 1815 Cédula de Gracias and the role of Intendent Ramírez, see Cruz Monclova (1965:48,54-55,78-84), Fernández Méndez (1975:212-216), Figueroa (1970:32,39-42), López (1974b:47-51), Steward et al (1956:50-52); see also Gutiérrez del Arroyo (1953).

[57]Mintz (1951), Quintero Rivera (1974a:95-96), Steward et al (1956:57).

[58]Mintz (1951:138), Quintero Rivera (1974a:95-96).

[59]See the descriptions by Brau (1972) and the selection by Francisco del Valle Atiles in Fernández Méndez (1976:505-540).

[60]On Spain's second constitutional regime see Artola (1975:45-49), Herr (1974:79-81), Payne (1973, Vol. II:429-432). On its political implications for Puerto Rico, see Cruz Monclova (1965:105-172) and Figueroa (1970:45-53).

[61]Cossío (1915:28), Osuna (1949:29-30).

[62]Osuna (1949:103).

[63]Osuna (1949:33-44).

[64]Gómez Tejera and Cruz López (1970:93-94), Hostos (1966: 365-370), Osuna (1949:29-30, 33-55). On the attempts to introduce the Lancasterian system in the U.S., see Katz (1971:10-11), Nasaw (1981:20-22).

[65]Katz (1971:10).

[66]Katz (1971:10).

[67]Translated by the author from a quote in Spanish cited in García Ochoa (1982:391).

[68]Hostos (1966:369-370), Osuna (1949:33-334).

[69]Osuna (1949:92).

[70]On Spain's second absolutist reaction see Artola (1975: 51-52), Herr (1974:81-82), Payne (1973, Vol. II:433-436). On the general historical trajectory of Puerto Rico during this period, see Cruz Monclova (1965:175-208), Figueroa (1970:63-76).

[71]Osuna (1949:31-32,104).

[72]Coll y Toste (1910:44-54), Cuesta Mendoza (1948:125-133), Gómez Tejera and Cruz López (1970:130-131), Osuna (1949:105).

[73]Osuna (1949:36).

[74]On Spain during the period between 1833 and 1868, see Artola (1975:179-261), Herr (1974:82-105), Payne (1973, Vol. II:436-463). On the general historical trajectory of Puerto Rico during this period, see Cruz Monclova (1965:211-513), Figueroa (1970:76-176).

[75]Artola (1975:143-145), Herr (1974:92-93), Payne (1973, Vol. II:456).

[76]Altamira (1930:212-213), Artola (1975:279-281), Cossio (1915:30-31), Herr (1974:103).

[77]Cipolla (1970:157-158); on the development and expansion of schooling in Spain after the enactment of the Moyano law, see in particular Altamira (213-217) and Artola (1975:280-282).

[78]Berbusse (1966:26-30).

[79]On this policy, which started in fact during the second absolutist regime of Ferdinand VII (1824-1833), see, for instance, Cruz Monclova (1965:196-198, 246-247, 312-315, 346-347, 385-387).

[80]Cruz Monclova (1965:315-316, 347, 510-513), López (1974b:58-59).

[81]Cruz Monclova (1965:385-386, 471-476), Fernández Méndez (1975:245-246), López (1974b:68), Quintero Rivera (1976b:25-26).

[82]Cruz Monclova (1965:320-322, 489), Osuna (1949:113).

[83]Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños (1979:74-78), Quintero Rivera (1976b:16).

[84]As shown in Table 1 (Chapter II), the slave population of the Island increased rapidly in the first half of the 19th century, but it never exceeded the 11.5 percent of the total population that it reached in 1846; after that year it began to decrease in absolute terms. On the legal aspects of the slave trade in Puerto Rico, see Chapters V, VI, XI, XII, XIII of Díaz Soler (1974).

[85]On the forced labor regime of the "work-book passes" system see Gómez Acevedo (1970) and Mintz (1951).

[86]Díaz Soler (1974:218-220).

[87]López (1974b:64).

[88]On the abolition of slavery, see Chapters XI and XII of Díaz Soler (1974), and on the abolition of the "libreta", see Chapters XX through XXII of Gómez Acevedo (1970).

[89]Fernández Méndez (1975:253-254) and Chapter III of Picó de Hernández (1974). This group of liberal intellectuals and professionals included, among others, José Julián Acosta, Román Baldorioty de Castro, Ramón Emeterio Betances, Eugenio María de Hostos, Segundo Ruiz Belvis, and Alejandro Tapia y Rivera.

[90]Particularly useful as sources of information on school developments in Puerto Rico through the rest of the 19th century are Colón Rosado (1981:18-27,177-207,271-286) and Osuna (1949:28-124). See also in this respect,Coll y Toste (1910), Cuesta Mendoza (1948), Gómez Tejera and Cruz López (1970:77-144), and U.S. Senate (1901:111-142). Cruz Monclova (1965, 1970, 1971) provides numerous details throughout his 19th history of Puerto Rico.

[91]Osuna (1949:39).

[92]Osuna (1949:41-42,44-48).

[93]Osuna (1949:36,619).

[94]U.S. War Department (1900a:33).

[95]Cipolla (1970:123).

[96]Cipolla (1970:158).

[97]U.S. War Department (1900b:711).

[98]Osuna (1949:54-59); also Cruz Monclova (1965:372-373).

[99]Osuna (1949:55).

[100]Osuna (1949:55).

[101]Osuna (1949:54).

[102]Osuna (1949:59-61).

[103]Brau (1972:61,106).

[104]Osuna (1949:59), Trías Monge (1980:26).

[105]Osuna (1949:107-115).

[106]Colón Rosado (1981:19-20, 184-190, 279-282), Osuna (1949:113-116).

[107]Coll y Coste (1910:64), Gómez Tejera and Cruz López (1970:132).

[108]Coll y Toste (1910:98), Cruz Monclova (1965:493).

[109]On the conflict between the liberal insular elites and the Jesuits, see Berbusse (1966), Cruz Monclova (1970:829), Hostos (1966:379-382, 384-385).

[110]See Cruz Monclova (1965:361-513).

[111]On the abolitionist movement in Puerto Rico during the 1860s, see Chapter XI and XII of Díaz Soler (1974).

[112]On the "Grito de Lares," see Cruz Monclova (1965:440-465), Figueroa (1970:177-194), Silén (1973:89-106).

[113]On the revolutionary changes in Spain during this period, see Artola (1975:363-397), Herr (1974:105-112), Payne (1973, Vol. II:463-487). For the corresponding changes in Puerto Rico, see Cruz Monclova (1970, Vol. 1), Figueroa (1970:195-234), Trías Monge (1980:52-61).

[114]López (1974b:75).

[115]On the insular political parties during the last 3 decades of Spanish rule in Puerto Rico, see the excellent summaries by Bothwell (1979, Vol, I-I:1-25) and Trías Monge (1980:57-67, 74-89).

[116]Osuna (1949:62).

[117]Gómez Tejera and Cruz López (1970:134-135), Hostos (1966:378-379).

[118]On Spain during the period constitutional monarchy between 1874 and 1898, see Herr (1974:113-132), Payne (1973, Vol. II:488-512), Vicens Vives et al (1972, Vol. V: 319-333). On Puerto Rico During the 1874-1898 period, see Cruz Monclova (1970, 1971), Figueroa (1970:234-319). On Sanz, see also Gómez Acevedo (1956).

[119]Payne (1973, Vol. II:489).

[120]Pedreira (1949).

[121]On the economic situation of the Island during the last third of the 19th century, see Bergad (1978:64-73), Fernández Méndez (1975:268-270), and García (1974).

[122]Carroll (1899:153), U.S. War Department (1900a:152).

[123]Bergad (1978:63)

[124]U.S. War Department (1900a:354).

[125]Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños (1970:81-82); regarding the increasing misery and exploitation of the peasants in the coffee regions, see Picó (1981a, 1981b).

[126]Cruz Monclova (1970:369), Quintero Rivera (1974a:102).

[127]García and Quintero Rivera (1982:13-34), Quintero Rivera (1978).

[128]U.S. War Department (1900a:95, 97).

[129]U.S. War Department (1900a:95, 97).

[130]This and the following occupational census data on women in 1899 is taken from Tables 24 and 26 of U.S. War Department (1900a); also Rivera Quintero (1979:7-8).

[131]See Rivera Quintero (1979:4-7).

[132]U.S. War Department (1900a:354).

[133]Rivera Quintero (1979:5).

[134]U.S. War Department (1900a:96,331).

[135]U.S. War Department (1900a:95-96).

[136]U.S. War Department (1900a:328-331).

[137]Ramos Mattei (1982:113-114), Steward et al (1956:344).

[138]See, for instance, Carroll (1899:51).

[139]On Barbosa, see Pedreira (1937).

[140]See, for instance, Mathews (1974:316-318).

[141]See Osuna (1949:63-69) for an overview of Sanz's school policies.

[142]Gómez Tejera and Cruz López (1970:135-138).

[143]See Osuna (1949:77-93) on the 1880 organic school law; also Gómez Tejera and Cruz López (1970:108-116).

[144]U.S. War Department (1900a:75-77, 1900b:150-152).

[145]For Puerto Rico and Cuba, see U.S. War Department (1900a:75, 1900b:150), for Spain, see Cipolla (1970:58).

[146]Cipolla (1970:123), U.S. War Department (1900a:79).

[147]Carroll (1899:649).

[148]Bureau of the Census (1910:1208).

[149]On the Civil Institute of Secondary Education, see Gómez Tejera and Cruz López (1970:138-144), Hostos (1966: 379-384), Osuna (1949:116-118).

[150]Carroll (1899:649), Osuna (1949:619).

[151]On the College of the Mothers of the Sacred Heart, see Colón Rosado (1981:20-22, 191-196, 283-284). The Mothers of the Sacred Heart also established a "Free School" (Escuela Gratuita) for poor girls, but this was separate from the College, and provided only primary education.

[152]Hostos (1966:385), Osuna (1949:118-119).

[153]Hostos (1966:385-386).

[154]Osuna (1949:119), U.S. Senate (1901:141-142).

[155]Hostos (1966:390-391).

[156]U.S. Senate (1901:24).

[157]Carroll (1899).

[158]For a historical description of the artisan and working class sectors in Puerto Rico during the latter part of the 19th century, see García and Quintero Rivera (1982:13-34) and Quintero Rivera (1978).

[159]U.S. War Department (1900a:328-330); also Quintero Rivera (1978:119-120).

[160]Carroll (1899:51, 715-717, 757).

[161]Osuna (1949:111).

[162]Hostos (1966:389-390), Osuna (1949:111-112).

[163]Both Picó de Hernández (1974:74) and Petrovich (1979: 14) suggest that the program of this short lived institution was not oriented towards utilitarian objectives, but it seems that such a suggestion hardly applies to a program of studies in which 2 ot is 4 faculties were directly geared to train professionals.

[164]U.S. War Department (1900a:73, 77).

[165]U.S. War Department (1900a:73, 268).

[166]Collins (1979:4).

[167]U.S. War Department (1900a:75-77).

[168]On the Charter of Autonomy, see Berbusse (1966), Cruz Monclova (1971, pt.3), Gould (1969), Ramos de Santiago (1970b), Trías Monge (1980). The document is included in Ramos de Santiago (1970a).

[169]Cruz Monclova (1971, pt.3:104), Osuna (1949:93).

[170]Hostos (1939:192-196).

[171]Perhaps, this view can be seen most clearly in the position of the liberal elites against the work-book pass ("libretas") system, favoring in substitution of this system a moralizing and disciplining primary school system for the peasant population. See Gómez Acevedo (1970:204-205, 209-210, 445). The views of Salvador Brau (1972), a well known 19th century liberal creole are also typical of the educational views of this social sector; see especially this essays "Las clases jornaleras de Puerto Rico" and "La campesina."

[172]Hostos (1939:37).

[173]See Brau (1972:61, 117-118) for a liberal critique of the position of landowners regarding the primary education of the rural population.

C H A P T E R I V

SCHOOL, POLITICS AND THE ECONOMY: THE U.S. MILITARY REGIME, 1898-1900

Background to the U.S. Colonization of Puerto Rico

The U.S. military occupation of Puerto Rico in 1898 marked an abrupt rupture in the recently established semi-autonomous colonial status of the Island and in its mercantile capitalist relationships under Spain's dying imperial power. From then on Puerto Rico will be under the hegemony of the growingly powerful and expansionist U.S. government and corporate capitalist economy, a radical transformation in colonial relationships that would result in profound changes in the political, sociocultural and economic structures of the Island. In a way, the change in colonial sovereignty marked just an intensification of insular trends which as shown in Chapter III were already developing in varying degrees throughout the 19th century: such trends, for example, as the growth of an export agro-monocultural capitalist economy; the increased trade dependency on the U.S. market; the massive transformation of small farm owners and subsistence farmers into dependent rural and urban wage-laborers; the rise of liberal and meritocratically

oriented groupings of professionals and intellectuals; and the expansion of a State controlled and supported public school system. Nonetheless, these trends along with other persisting structural characteristics--e.g., the patriarchal and racist differentiation of the division of labor--suffered a dramatic re-orientation with the impact of the colonial political-military, economic and cultural forces of the U.S.

Before overviewing the effects of such new colonial situation, it is worth tracing back some of the historical forces which led to the Spanish American War and, consequently, to the U.S. occupation and colonization of Puerto Rico.[1] The immediate pretext and justification of the U.S. government in declaring war on Spain was the sinking of the U.S. battleship Maine in Habana Harbor in February 1898, at the height of the independence war that Cuban rebels had been waging against Spanish authorities since 1895. But pressure for U.S. intervention in this struggle had been steadily growing for some time as a result, on the one hand, of the growing popular sentiment in the U.S.--a sentiment partly manipulated to a point of hysteria by some of the most influential native newspapers (publishers like Hearst and Pulitzer)--in support of the liberation struggle of the Cuban rebels; and on the other hand, of a powerful and long-term nationalist-capitalist expansionist drive promoted not

only by the leading industrial, commercial and financial interests of the U.S. but also by the central federal government, the military, and by leading politicians and intellectuals, a drive which went beyond the concerns of securing U.S. political, military and economic hegemony over the Spanish Caribbean colonies.

In this respect, one must remember that since the onset of European colonialism, the white settlers of North America began to move westward, driving forcefully the native Americans out of their lands and ever further West, and that this thrust continued more extensively after the U.S. war of independence, leading not only to the reduction of the native Americans to reservations but also to the conquest of Texas, New Mexico and California from Mexico. Moreover, before reaching the Pacific, with the proclamation of the Monroe Doctrine in 1823--that is by the time when most of the countries of continental Spanish America had obtained their independence from Spain--the U.S. government was proclaiming to the world, and particularly to the European nations, that the entire Western hemisphere was to be under its exclusive sphere of influence.[2] Furthermore, after completing its extension to the Pacific, with the addition of California, the U.S. acquired Alaska, and throughout the 19th century, U.S. policy makers and Congressional leaders persistently suggested the desirability

of acquiring Canada, Mexico, Cuba, Haiti, Santo Domingo, Hawaii and Puerto Rico, and pressed for the opening of the vast markets of the Far East (e.g. China and Japan), for the building of a Central American isthmian canal under U.S. control, and the establishment of naval bases and coaling stations in the Caribbean and the Pacific.[3]

One of the principal factors pressing for such an expansionist thrust was the constant demand by the ever larger U.S. agricultural and industrial businesses for new markets for their excess surplus goods.[4] Another important factor was the search for secured new territories that could supply U.S. economic interests with cheap raw materials and agricultural commodities not produced in sufficient quantity domestically. But aside from these and other important economic reasons there were additional political and ideological factors contributing to the expansionist thrust. Interestingly, from the beginning of U.S. history, territorial or foreign expansion had been viewed by many of its leaders and citizens not only as a way of establishing new markets but also as a solution for domestic social conflicts.[5] The conquest of the West, and the promise of land, riches and adventure that it offered could be seen accordingly as a way out from poverty for the increasingly restless, militant and politically enfranchised, poor rural and urban working classes. Not less important

in fueling expansionism was the ever present and at times fairly popular, nationalist-missionary ideologies well embedded in the notion of "Manifest Destiny," cultivated in large measure by the political, economic and intellectual elites of the U.S., both to justify its growing worldwide power as well as to allay the rising domestic social conflicts.[6] According to this later vision, the U.S. had the "Manifest Destiny" to expand its frontiers and stretch its influence over the whole continent and ultimately over the whole world and in so doing extend to the "inferior" uncivilized or backward nations (or "races") of the world the civilizing influence of its dominant Anglo-Saxon, Protestant, liberal democratic and industrial institutions. As shall be seen later, this same missionary, albeit ethnocentric and racist vision of the superiority of U.S. institutions will be used again at the end of the century to rationalize the imperialism on which this nation embarked with the start of the Spanish-American War.

By the end of the 19th century the U.S. had completed its westward continental drive, and was in the process of becoming one of the world's most powerful, productive and wealthiest agro-industrial societies. Moreover, since the Civil War, there had been a marked trend toward business concentration, centralization and bureaucratization, that is, toward a form of monopolistic or corporate capitalism

in which a few giants, private conglomerates, centered principally in the victorious and increasingly urban industrial northeastern part of the nation, began to dominate not only the national economy but also to gain substantial influence over the local, state and federal levels of government.[6] The Civil War, marked, on the other hand, a strong new commitment to national unity and to a stronger national government as opposed to "state rights" though for sure the U.S. still possessed during this time one of the most decentralized and liberal democratic political systems in the world (even so it must be remembered that in spite of the advances made toward universal male suffrage immediately after the Civil War--for example, in the extension of voting rights to black males--many states, particularly the Southern ones, maintained or reinstituted poll taxes and/or literacy requirements in writing, measures which in fact disenfranchised not only most black males but also many poor working white males.)[7]

Furthermore, there was also during this period a significant trend toward centralization and bureaucratization at the various levels of government (i.e., municipal, state and federal) and conversely, a significant decline in the power and autonomy of representative bodies at the local level. This process was particularly evident during the "Progressive Era" of the turn of the 20th century

(1890s to the 1920s), and was to a large extent fostered by the increasingly powerful corporate elites of the North-eastern states that were greatly influenced by the corporate organizational model of centralized, bureaucratic and professionalized management.[8] To be sure, the leadership of the Progressive Movement were not reduced to its corporate component, and though it was basically white and Anglo Protestant, it included aside from corporate businessmen many professional and middle class individuals, as well as some labor leaders--most notably, Samuel Compers and other leaders of the American Federation of Labor (AFL), the largest and dominant trade union in the U.S. at the turn of the century, characterized incidentally by its labor conservatism and by its exclusionary practices of generally keeping out from their ranks non-skilled workers, women, blacks and the new immigrants from Eastern and Southern Europe.[9] Most Progressives saw the large capitalist corporation not merely as the most efficient, productive and ultimately socially beneficial economic organization but also the most adequate organizational model for managing effectively a growingly complex, conflict-ridden and heterogeneous society, with,on the one hand, an expanding largely immigrant, and increasingly restless wage labor population in the large urban industrial-commercial centers, which had become ever more militant, particularly since

the Civil War, in a number of labor strikes and struggles, and to a lesser extent in a diversity of radical, socialist and anarchist organizations; and on the other, a large impoverished sector of also increasingly restive and militant small farm owners and tenant farmers, who formed the core of the large Populist Movement of the 1880s and 1890s. Many of the political reforms advocated by the Progressives were undertaken under the banner of "good" and "efficient" government, often with the expressed purpose of combatting the practices of graft and patronage that were commonly resorted to,especially by the political machines in the cities with the large immigrant, working class population.[10] The Progressive's political reforms pressed specifically for stronger city mayors and city managers and for a bureaucracy of civil servants recruited in terms of their professional qualifications or competencies. But these and other of the reforms sponsored by the Progressives--like for example those regarding public education--were also geared to break the power of the city political machines catering to the demands of the largely working-class, immigrant populations, and at a deeper level, to avert what the Progressives and other members of the dominant, Anglo-Protestant capitalist and professional elites considered to be an explosive situation that not merely threatened to break apart the North American society

along class and ethnic lines, but also challenged their dominance in the nation. Such aims can be seen very clearly in what they advocated and did regarding public education, reforms about which a few words are necessary for they not only shaped the evolution of U.S. domestic school systems but also prefigured to a great extent those that were proposed for its colonies, including of course, for Puerto Rico.

On the whole, the educational reforms sponsored by the Progressives were to a significant degree a follow-up of those advocated by the common school reforms of the 1840s and 1850s, whose main object had been in establishing universal, compulsory, tax-supported, gratuitous, centralized and bureaucratized school systems capable of transforming the increasingly enfranchised, largely rural and/or foreign born urban laboring masses into dependable, productive and patriotic "American" citizens.[11] Notwithstanding their ethnocentric, racist and anti-working class biases, the Progressives like the common school reformers before them, strongly believed that more efficient and uniform "American" school systems could play a central role in nation-building by transforming the culturally pluralistic and class-ethnic conflict ridden U.S. society into <u>one</u> culturally homogeneous and socially harmonious "American" people--hence "<u>e pluribus unum</u>."[12] Moreover, they

also insisted--again, many sincerely--that public schooling would not only provide the working classes and their large component of foreign and rural immigrants with equal educational opportunity to succeed in America on the basis of their own merits, competence and achievements, but at the same time, educate them in the so-called republican, self-governing and industrious habits of Anglo-Protestant America. However, as emphasized by U.S. educational leaders, the American republicanism and industriousness that was to be learned in such schooling process--especially regarding the "Americanization" of the children of the working classes and immigrant groups--was characterized not so much by public democratic participation and self-activity but rather by the habits of discipline, punctuality, competitiveness and of respect for authority and property, or more precisely, by the orderly and law-abiding habits required of a newly evolving, urbanized, bureaucratized and corporate social order.[13]

To ensure such a mass "Americanizing" process, it was necessary, according to the school reformers, to restructure the educational systems, primarily those at the city and state levels, in a direction that would remove as far as possible the schools from the control of local communities and/or neighborhoods and, hence, from the increasingly enfranchised popular classes, and vest their

control in small, centralized boards of school superintendents, the latter of which were to be assisted by a professionalized and specialized administrative and teaching staff.[14] This centralization of power in supposedly efficient, politically disinterested,and professionalized administrative and supervisory bodies were modeled on the hierarchical, bureaucratized structures of the private corporations--as were the reformed municipal governments of the same period--and to a lesser extent of the Prussian school system,[15] as both types of organizations were much admired by the political and educational reformers, who saw in their highly centralized, bureaucratized structure the capacity to ensure, through top down, expert-formulated directives and prescriptions not just the capacity to effectively control and instruct a large mass of diverse students but at the same time, to control and coordinate effectively a large army of teachers, principals and other subordinates of the school hierarchy. Efficiency and effectiveness were to be further enhanced by a better trained and more specialized teaching, guidance and administrative staff (thus the emphasis is the development of normal schools and programs of professional preparation); by the careful classification of grading according to the age and attainment of pupils; by regulated promotions and standard examinations; and by uniform but

differentiated curricula adapted to the different classes of students (thus the emphasis in incorporating vocational, industrial and commercial programs, courses withing the same comprehensive high school system, an emphasis, incidentally, which in spite of the egalitarian intention and "classless society" vision of some of its promoters, and despite the class openness of the comprehensive high schools, continued to stratify students along class--and sex and racial--lines through the differentiated tracks.)[16]

It is worth pointing out that while the U.S. school reformers of the late 19th century and the turn of the 20th century concentrated much of their efforts in building efficient, "Americanizing" school systems at city and state levels, they also made important attempts to nationalize their crusade. This was done mainly through the agencies of the National Teachers' Association, a broadly based organization of teachers, administrators, and school officers, founded in 1857 and reorganized in 1870 as the National Educational Association (NEA), and the U.S. Bureau (or Office) of Education established by Congress in 1867 as a non-cabinet department and then reconstituted in 1869 as a bureau of the U.S. Department of Interior.[17] The federal Bureau of Education was basically a central bureau for collecting and disseminating school statistics and information, and though it lacked centralized power of

control, supervision or disbursement of funds over the school systems of the U.S., it played a very important role, together with the N.E.A. (with which it had a very close working relationship) in promoting the centralization and bureaucratization of these school systems and in fostering among them common educational objectives, curricula, teaching methods, evaluation and administrative procedures and even similar school architectural designs. While doing these, both the U.S. Office of Education and the N.E.A. championed the nationalistic "Americanization" goals that "common school" and Progressive educational reformers had assigned to the public school systems, and like these reformers they were to emphasize such features of "Americanism" as industrial capitalism, "good" and "ordered" self-government, and the meritocratic and achievement-oriented ideas of equal educational opportunity and professionalism. Moreover, they also championed the idea that the extension of public schools would particularly "Americanize" and hence civilize if not pacify, the restless farmers and working classes, the large number of foreign immigrants, the American Indians and the blacks, and when the time came, the large number of "natives" of the insular possessions acquired by the U.S. at the turn of the century.

Two major exponents of these ideas were John Eaton and William T. Harris, U.S. Commissioners of Education in 1870-

1886 and 1889-1906 respectively and perhaps the most distinguished and important heads of the federal Bureau of Education.[18] It is of interest to advance here that John Eaton, who in his long crusade for extended free public education would frequently argue in terms of the cost-benefits of education in pacifying and/or assimilating the working classes, the American Indians and blacks, was to become at the end of his life the first U.S. official in charge of organizing Puerto Rico's public educational system under U.S. rule. From this post, as shall be seen later, he was to undertake the first steps in building on the Island an "American" school system which in his view--and that of his successors in that post--was to be the most important instrument in "Americanizing" the Puerto Rican people. On the whole, Eaton, like Harris, the N.E.A. and most of the leading U.S. educators of the time supported and/or cooperated enthusiastically with the imperialistic enterprises of their government at the turn of the century and they rationalized such enterprises with altruistic--albeit paternalistic, ethnocentric and racist--civilizing, libertarian and human ideals, reminiscent of the "Manifest Destiny" and "white man's burden" rhetoric.[19]

A good example of this rhetoric was given by Commissioner Harris, perhaps the best and most forceful articulator of such "enlightened" imperialism, in his 1899 address

to the N.E.A. entitled an "Educational Policy for Our New Possessions." Therein he stated,

> If we cannot come into contact with lower civilizations without bringing extermination to their people, we are still far from the goal. It must be our great object to improve our institutions until we can bring blessings to lower peoples and get them on a road to rapid progress. We must take in hand their education. We must emancipate them from tribal forms and usages, and train them into productive industry and the individual ownership of land. We must take them out of the form of civilization that rests on tradition and mere external authority, and substitute for it a civilization of the printed page which governs by public opinion and by insight rather than by mere authority. Such a civilization we have a right to enforce on this earth. We have a right to work for the enlightenment of all peoples and to give our aid to lift them into local self-government. But local self-government cannot exist where there is no basis of productive industry and book-learning.[20]

These remarks say of course little of the economic and military advantages that U.S. leaders expected to obtain from the new overseas possessions; indeed, as was noted earlier in this section, such advantages were clearly in the minds of many of them even before the events of 1898 to which now this Chapter turns.

A severe economic depression hit the U.S. in 1893 triggering the start of a new period of great working-class unrest and social turmoil. And again, as in previous periods of economic depression and social crisis, the expansion into foreign markets was seen and presented by

U.S. political and economic leaders as one of the principal--if not the principal--solutions not only of the problems of underconsumption of industrial and agricultural goods--which was thought to be the main explanation of the depression--but also for alleviating the growing social unrest since the expansion of the foreign markets was expected to provide the opportunity for greater labor employment and security.[21] Nonetheless, the rhetoric about securing expanded foreign markets for U.S. goods was, like in previous occasions, complemented and reinforced with the more idealistic, missionary rhetoric embodied in the notions of "Manifest Destiny" and of the "white man's burden." These notions were given particular emphasis and currency by the Republican Party which in 1896 won the U.S. national election with a platform which called for an ambitious expansionist national program.[22] Henry Cabot Lodge, the then influential Republican senator from Massachusetts, well expressed in 1895 the imperialist expansionist policies of his party:

> In the interests of our commerce... we should build the Nicaragua(sic) canal, and for the protection of that canal and for the sake of our commercial supremacy in the Pacific we should control the Hawaiian islands and maintain our influence in Samoa... and when the Nicaraguan canal is built, the island of Cuba... will become a necessity... The great nations are rapidly absorbing for their future expansion and their present defense all the waste places of the earth. It is a movement which makes for civilization and the advancement of the race. As

> one of the great nations of the world the United States must not fall out of line of march.[23]

The electoral victory of the Republicans came one year after the initiation of the Cuban Independence War, a conjuncture which as noted earlier, provided U.S. leaders with the opportunity to pursue its overseas expansionist policy by appealing not just to the nationalist, capitalist and imperialist forces in the U.S., but also the libertarian sentiments of wide sectors of the population who supported the independence struggle of the Cuban rebels. Spain's declining and weak imperial power gave the increasingly powerful North American republic a convenient target for its expansionist ambitions by providing the latter an easy opportunity to ensure its interests and presence not only in Cuba, but also in the Spanish possessions of Puerto Rico, the Philippines and Guam. Moreover, at the height of the Spanish-American war, the U.S. also formally annexed the Hawaiian Islands which had been previously colonized by U.S. settlers.

But while the events of 1898 secured the U.S. presence in Cuba, Puerto Rico, the Philippines and Hawaii--and through these, a strategic position to advance its commercial interests in Japan and China--they did not settle the precise political status of these islands under U.S. hegemony. Even though McKinley and most Republicans favored

the application of a general colonial policy, there were internal disagreements over the specifics of such a policy as well as a strong opposition to it, originating mainly in the Democratic Party and the so-called Anti-Imperialist League--an organization headed by some businessmen, politicians, intellectuals and labor leaders. This opposition led to an important and heated congressional and press debate over the proper form, strategy and tactics of U.S. expansionism.[24] There was a general consensus among the main participants in the debate about the need for the U.S. to expand its economic, political, moral power and leadership in the world. Even some important labor leaders, including the influential Samuel Compers, of the A.F.L., were not opposed to expansion per se.[25] The debate was basically not over the merits of overseas expansion but whether the islands now under the control of the U.S. were to be organized as colonies, as self-governing territories destined for eventual U.S. statehood, or as independent nations either under the formal political "protectorate" of Washington or under its informal economic hegemony. It is worth remembering in this context that the previous westward expansion of the U.S. had been characterized by the acquisition or conquest of sparsely populated (by American Indians, Spanish settlers or Mexicans) contiguous lands by white U.S. settlers who had organized those areas as tran-

sitional self-governing territories destined for eventual U.S. statehood. But now the U.S. found itself with non-contiguous possessions inhabited by populous "natives" with alien languages, cultures and political traditions who were generally looked upon by most participants in the imperialist debate of the turns of the century as culturally backward if not innately inferior, and hence as either inherently or presently unfit for self-government. These paternalistic, ethnocentric and racist attitudes were held in varying degrees by both Republicans and Democrats, and many on both sides of the debate were reluctant to grant U.S. citizenship and statehood to those "backward" people.[26] Incidentally, such reluctance appears to have been more vigorous and widespread with respect to the Philippines, which in addition to being the most non-white, non-European, and no-Christian of all the insular populations acquired by the U.S. were also the most rebellious against the U.S. military occupation forces.[27] There were on the other hand relatively less reservations in the U.S. with respect to the annexation of Cuba, Puerto Rico and Hawaii as eventual states of the Union for even though their culture was different and their racial composition mixed, they were not only friendlier to the U.S. colonizers but were also more Christianized and Europeanized; moreover, they were either chiefly populated

by whites (like in Cuba and Puerto Rico) or previously colonized by U.S. settlers (like Hawaii).

In any case, Republicans and Democrats differed sharply on the question of how to deal with these alien islanders. For Cuba, to which before the 1898 war the U.S. Congress had pledged sovereignty, President McKinley and the Republicans favored a limited form of independence under the "protectorate" of the U.S. For Puerto Rico and the Philippines they favored annexation as outright colonies for an indefinite period. In this way, the Republicans argued, the U.S. would not only secure its economic and military interests in these islands but at the same time would secure, through a long process of tutelage and education, the "elevation" of their "primitive" people, to the level of democratic and industrial advancement of the U.S. Thus, for instance, Elihu Root, McKinley's Secretary of War, the cabinet official in charge of the U.S. military governments of Cuba, Puerto Rico and the Philippines and a central and influential figure in the formulation of the Repulican administration colonial policy, justified U.S. colonial tutelage over Puerto Rico in the following words:

> In determining the question as to the form of government and the participation of the people of the island therein, the most important fact to be considered is that the people have not yet been educated in the art of self-government, or any really honest government... (B)efore the people can be fully intrusted (sic) with self-

> government they must first learn the lesson of self-control and respect for the principles of constitutional government, which require acceptance of its peaceful decision. This lesson will necessarily be slowly learned, because it is a matter not of intellectual apprehension, but of character and of acquired habits of thought and feeling. It would not be of no use to present the people of Puerto Rico now a written constitution or frame of laws, however perfect, and tell them to live under it. They would inevitably fail without a course of tuition under a strong and guiding hand. With that tuition for a time their natural capacity, it is hoped make them a self-governing people (sic).[28]

A similar justification was put forward by General George W. Davis, U.S. military governor of Puerto Rico (1899-1900), in emphasizing the role of an "American school system" in educating Puerto Ricans for self-government, a role that, curiously enough, he illustrated with the case of the North American Indians. Thus, he stated:

> The United States is now responsible to the world for the good government of this island... It is assumed to be the true policy of the United States government at the earliest time practicable, to grant to the island full local autonomous government... The social, industrial, moral and intellectual condition of the people is such as to seem to me to demand, before local self-government be granted, that they undergo a period of probation. Probably not more than 1 in 10 of these people can read and write their own language, and only about 1 in 36 is qualified to vote in franchise basis that requires a knowledge of reading and writing by the individual... A great many of these people are in a social and industrial condition not better than the reservation Indians in the United States. To these Indians who are not taxpayers the United States laws deny the franchise; but the United States government does not leave these Indians to provide their own schools. Instead, vast sums of money have been and are being expended in educating them for the duties and responsibilities of citizen-

> ship. These poor people in Porto Rico (sic) are more helpless than the Indians, for the latter own the land on which they live... There are 300,000 children only about 7 percent of whom have been and are being taught at all. They are the generations which in a few years will be in control of the destinies of the island. Unless assisted and protected they will be no better qualified for assuming the grave responsibilities awaiting them than are their fathers. The most important and efficient means to the desired end is the public school.[29]

Indeed, as T.R. Clark has shown, this idea of "educating the natives for self-government" would be repeated frequently by U.S. officials in subsequent decades to justify U.S. colonial rule over Puerto Rico.[30] Moreover, as shall be seen later, this idea, along with that of training the natives in the industrious habits of the people of the U.S. would constitute the prime expressed goals of the "American" school system that was to be built under the "strong and guiding hand" of U.S. authorities.

Interestingly, in the celebrated debate on U.S. imperialism at the turn of the century, the Democrats and the Anti-Imperialist League opposed the policy of colonialism even if such policy was guided by the missionary altruistic ideal of educating the natives in the "American" virtues of self-government and industrious productivity.[31] Their main argument was that colonialism violated the U.S. constitution and its traditional forms of "liberal democratic" territorial expansion by which new regions were

incorporated as transitional self-governing entities destined for eventual statehood. They argued accordingly that if the insular territories were to be annexed they should obtain the traditional rights of self-government, U.S. citizenship and eventual statehood enjoyed by all previous incorporated territories. However, except for a few who actively favored such form of annexation, most opponents preferred an expansionist policy which would maintain the overseas territories either as independent nations under informal U.S. economic and political control or, at the most, as eventual formal independent nations under a transitional formal U.S. protectorship.[32] Indeed, while some of the so-called "anti-imperialists" appear to have been genuinely concerned with the establishment of liberal democratic self-governments in the overseas territories, whether in the form of U.S. statehood or of a sovereign nation, there were also some, especially those belonging to the Southern segment of the Democratic party, who opposed the Republican's colonial annexation policy because they feared that it would lead to the granting of U.S. citizenship and statehood to people they considered culturally and racially inferior.[33]

Whatever the arguments, the Republicans won the immediate battles of such turn of the century imperialist debate. Yet, the colonial policy that actively evolved

over the coming years with regard to Cuba, Puerto Rico, Hawaii and the Philippines was a composite of the Republican's outright colonialist positions and of the Democrat's anti-colonial expansionist ones.[34] Hawaii soon became an "incorporated" self-governing territory and its people were soon granted U.S. citizenship. Cuba remained under the rule of U.S. military governors until 1901 and from then until 1934 it was maintained as a formal protectorate of the U.S. by the terms of the Platt Amendment. (Incidentally, during the same time, the U.S. established other protectorates--of shorter duration--in the Dominican Republic, Haiti and Nicaragua.) Puerto Rico and the Philippines were organized as colonial "non-incorporated" territories without U.S. citizenship, by virtue of the Organic Acts that were respectively granted to them in 1900 and 1902.[35] Ironically, the Filipinos were granted such political status after thir ferocious rebellion against the new rulers was crushed by the U.S. military while Puerto Ricans were granted the same political regime even though the overwhelming majority of its people had welcomed or cooperated with the North American occupying forces and, in fact, even though most of its leaders had expressed admiration for the liberal democratic and capitalist institutions of North America, and had favored the annexation of the Island to the U.S. It would take nearly 50 years for

the people of Puerto Rico to win any significant degree of self-government under the U.S., and even this much delayed achievement, significantly enough, would in some respects give the Islanders less insular autonomy than the one they obtained from Spain in 1898 with the Autonomy Charter.

Political and Socio-Economic Developments

As was just noted, Puerto Ricans received the U.S. occupying forces in very friendly and cooperative terms.[36] Many of the Island's liberal and autonomist leaders not only admired the liberal democratic institutions of the North American republic, but actually also expected that this nation would grant Puerto Rico greater autonomy, freedom and economic benefits than those ever attained under Spanish rule. Moreover, their expectations had been greatly raised by the famous proclamation that General Nelson A. Miles, Commander-in-Chief of the U.S. occupation forces in Puerto Rico, made to the Islanders just a few days after the occupation of the Island. The proclamation read in part as follows:

> ... in the cause of liberty, justice and humanity, its (U.S.) military forces have come to occupy the island of Puerto Rico. They came bearing the banner of freedom... They bring you the fostering arm of a nation of free people, whose greatest power is justice and humanity to all those living within its fold... We have not come to make war upon the people of a country that for centuries has

> been oppressed, but on the contrary, to bring you protection, not only to yourself but to your property, to promote your prosperity, and to bestow upon you the immunities and blessings of the liberal institutions of our government.[37]

But the expectations of the Puerto Rican liberal and autonomist leaders soon began to be increasingly frustrated. For them the long duration of the military regime was not only contradictory to what they considered to be the traditional liberal democratic ideals of the U.S. but also excessive in the light of the friendly welcome and support given by the Islanders to the invading forces.[38] Furthermore, for these insular leaders the military regime meant not only a sharp regression from the liberal democratic and self-government attainments of the 1897 Charter of Autonomy, but also a drastic loss of power for them as a ruling creole elite in comparison to the power they had achieved with the Spanish Autonomous regime in the political administrative structure of the Island. In certain respects, the military governors maintained some of the governmental bodies (e.g. the electoral municipal councils), laws and civil rights (e.g. freedom of assembly, speech and the press) established under Spanish rule, but overall these were subject to the arbitrary powers of the military governors, as was the case, for instance, with the municipalities, where they occasionally intervened to appoint or remove municipal officials or with the rights of free

expression and press, which at times they tried to limit especially in cases where the military regime was criticized.[39]

Regarding the working class sectors, it is true that the military rulers established the eight-hour workday, however, it also left in effect the anti-labor Spanish conspiracy laws which greatly restricted the rights of laborers to unionize and to strike.[40] Moreover, the military regime restricted suffrage rights to males 21 years and over who could read and write or who paid property taxes,[41] a measure which in effect, as deducted from Table 2, disenfranchised the overwhelming majority of Puerto Ricans if one considers for example that the literacy rate of the male population ten years and older was just 25.7 percent by 1899.

The military regime also eliminated or left in suspension other liberal democratic gains of the 1898 Autonomous regime. It abolished for instance the insular legislature, the Council of Secretaries (the Cabinet) which was directly responsible to the legislature, and the elected Provincial Deputation. In fact, in forcefully making clear their political supremacy at both the central and local levels of government, the military governors assumed "de facto" legislative powers and centralized the existing

administrative functions by abolishing the Provincial Deputation and reassigning its executive administrative functions together with those of the Council of Secretaries to a new council under the direct control of the military governorship.[42] One of the responsibilities eventually placed under the direct control of the military governor was the administration and supervision of public education, a measure which, as will be examined in the last section of this Chapter, was considered necessary by the U.S. colonial authorities for the establishment in Puerto Rico of a school system that could play an effective and fundamental role in the "Americanization" of the inhabitants of the Island. "Americanization" would become one of the most fundamental goals of the military regime as well as of the subsequent colonial civil regimes. In such endeavors, incidentally, U.S. colonial authorities would use not only the public school system but other public and private institutions, perhaps most notably, the legal-judicial system, which from the beginning was subjected to an intense process of assimilation to the U.S. legal system,[43] and the religious sphere of which more will be said later.

Aside from losing its recently achieved autonomy in the legal-political and cultural institutions of Puerto Rico to the U.S. military regime, the Puerto Rican elites, and principally its bourgeois, export-oriented hacendado

sectors also began to lose rapidly their dominant position in the economy to U.S. capitalist interests. As noted in Chapter III, coffee production had become during the second half of the 19th century the leading and most prosperous sector of the insular economy. But a series of developments following the U.S. occupation greatly weakened the economic position of most hacendados. Especially damaging was the new position in which the Island found itself within the customs barriers of the U.S. With the annexation of the Island to the U.S., the former lost its traditional export markets in Cuba and Europe (mainly Spain), where since 1898 it had to face higher import tariffs.[44] While this happened the U.S. maintained between 1898 and 1900 a trade policy with the Island which treated the latter exports to the mainland as those of foreign countries.[45] This limited drastically the U.S. market to Puerto Rico's main export crops, imposing higher custom tariff barriers to such staples as sugar and tobacco and leaving the Island's coffee to "freely" compete in that market with the much cheaper Brazilian coffee which was already favored by U.S. consumers. Also damaging to Puerto Rico's agricultural export producers were a series of measures enacted by the military authorities which although for the most part were backed by local hacendados and small farmers--for example, the suspension of laws of foreclosures and the devaluation of the Puerto

Rican "peso" relative to the U.S. dollar, both of which were intended to favor agriculturist debtors--resulted in effect in the freezing of credit operations and the reduction of the availability of capital for agricultural investment.[46] On top of all of the above came the San Ciriaco hurricane of 1899, which destroyed a substantial part of the Island's cash crops including about 80 percent of the slow maturing coffee crop,[47] and a subsequent decline in the world prices of coffee.[48]

As these political, economic and natural forces weakened considerably the insular agro-export bourgeoisie, especially those linked to coffee production, and partly on account of such conditions, U.S. capital began to rapidly control the main aspects of the Island's economy. U.S. investments were directed primarily to sugar and tobacco production, as well as to the financial, commercial and transportation infrastructure of these agro-export crops. Apparently, U.S. investors anticipated the eventual inclusion of these crops within the protective tariffs of the U.S. that would formally take place in 1901.[49] In any event, U.S. corporate interests benefitted particularly from the weakend position of the local landed bourgeoisie and of the small landowners since many of these would be forced to sell their lands at the same time when a large part of thier labor force, especially those of the stagnating

coffee areas, would be made available to the expanding sugar plantations. And so, the U.S. owned plantations began to rapidly control the best coastal agricultural lands of the Island and to establish there centralized, large scale sugar-mills ("centrales") which dominated the manufacturing phase of the production of sugar.[50] As shall be seen in the next Chapter, this process of land and capital concentration for sugar production under the control of U.S. corporate interests would intensify even more after 1900. The extent and rapidity of the penetration of U.S. capital in tobacco production is illustrated by the operations of the Puerto Rico American Tobacco Company, a U.S. conglomerate organized in Puerto Rico in 1899 and which only a few years later owned the main centers of tobacco processing and controlled most of the tobacco purchases from local farmers.[51]

With these developments, then, Puerto Rico's bourgeoisie and particularly, its coffee hacendado sector, who previously, during Spain's colonial (pre-Autonomous regime) political and commercial dominance, had nevertheless managed to retain control of the means of production (basically ownership of land), now had to face not only the hegemony of the colonial U.S. government but also the growing and encroaching direct control of U.S. corporate interests over agricultural and industrial production. As

will be seen more clearly in Chapter V, these developments and their intensification after 1900 would generate, together with the changes in the political and educational structure, a process of drastic geographical and occupational mobility as well as new patterns of social hierarchy and labor control which would have as its major dominating forces the growing power of both the increasingly centralized colonial governmental apparatus and the large-scale U.S. sugar plantation corporations.

It is noteworthy that even though it was evident that the above described developments were undermining the overall power of the insular elite, most of its sectors still hoped and expected that their traditional socio-economic, political and cultural aspirations would be enhanced by the eventual incorporation of Puerto Rico as a state of the U.S. This generalized sentiment was articulated in varying degrees by the two major political parties (and their respective presses) operating on the Island during this period, the Republican and Federal parties.[52] Both had been established in 1899 as successors respectively of the Historic Autonomist and Liberal Autonomist parties which in turn had been organized in 1897 as splinter descendants of the former Autonomist Party. During the next four decades these parties and their various

renamed successors--e.g. the Federal Party will be transformed into the Union Party in 1904 and into the Liberal Party in 1931--were to dominate electoral politics in Puerto Rico (though since 1917, as shall be seen later, they will be forced to share such role with the Socialist Party). Both parties, in their various transformations would serve as political instruments of different segments of the propertied and professional classes, both will be structured around the highly personalistic authoritarian figure of their respective party leaders--a characteristic already well developed during the last decade of Spanish colonial rule--and both will to a large extent mobilize political support on the basis of their capacity to distribute political patronage--a feature, which together with that of their personalistic authoritarian leadership, will characterize Puerto Rican party politics through the 20th century.[23] On the other hand, both parties subscribed formally to liberal democratic principles, and both strongly demanded the rapid end of U.S. military rule and the annexation of the Island to the U.S., first as a self-governing territory and then as a state of the federal union. In fact, it is relevant to advance in this connection that both parties favored the reorganization and expansion of public education according to U.S. models and methods. But apart from these general political socio-

economic and cultural similarities, of which more will be said later, these parties differed in important ways in terms of their positions regarding Puerto Rico's political status vis-a-vis the U.S., including over such issues as "self-government", decentralization and the so-called "Americanization" of Puerto Rico, differences which would be exacerbated by the strong personalistic antagonisms of their respective leadership. Over time they would also differ significantly in terms of the socio-economic composition of their leadership and electoral support, a difference which was still very ambiguous during the first two years of U.S. domination given the significant political realignments which took place at that time as a result of the drastic changes in the overall colonial structure of the Island.[54]

The leadership of the Republican Party was formed initially by a core of intellectuals and self-employed professionals, educated principally in the U.S., who were enthusiastic admirers of the prosperity of this country as well as of its modern individualistic, meritocratic, and liberal democratic institutions. These leaders had often family connections with the local landowning (hacendados) and commercial export-import sector, especially those involved with the sugar economy, who had business links

with the U.S. and who were interested in ensuring access to the vast markets of this nation. Over time, a large component of these sugar-linked groups would constitute an important segment of the leadership of the Republican Party, while a large segment of the growing white-collar urban wage-workers associated with these interests and with the colonial bureaucracy would become also an important part of their ranks. During a brief time at the turn of the century, the Republicans also received some support of the urban artisans and working classes, for many of these strongly believed that statehood and "Americanization" would result in the extension to the Island of the pro-labor laws and progressive liberal democratic rights already won by the U.S. working-classes.[55] Incidentally, it should be mentioned that a great part of the support that the Republicans got during the turn of the century was from black artisans and black white-collar workers (e.g. teachers, clerical workers, and musicians), partly because of the liberal-meritocratic ideology of the party, but perhaps more importantly, because its principal leader was for a long time a black professional, José C. Barbosa, who presented to them the example of one who had achieved upward social mobility through his own merit in the new social order represented by the U.S.[56] However, it should be noted that most of the leaders of the urban artisan

groups soon rejected the attempts of the Republican Party to obtain their electoral support, especially as the latter gave unconditional support to the anti-labor policies of the military regime and the first U.S. governors of the subsequent civil colonial regime.[57] This was, moreover, a period in which the labor leaders were organizing their first autonomous labor unions and political parties, most notably the Free Federation of Laborers (Federación Libre de Trabajadores--FLT) and the Socialist Workers' Party (Partido Socialista Obrero), of which more will be said in Chapter V.

With respect to the Republican Party, it is also worth noting that it favored strongly the rapid "Americanization" of Puerto Rico and thus the total assimilation of U.S. political, economic and cultural institutions.[58] In education, for example, it strongly supported the "Americanization" policies initiated by the military regime and by 1899, it had already gone on record in favor of the teaching of English in schools in order to make this language the eventual official language of Puerto Rico.[59] Politically, though the Republicans favored in principle the largest degree of insular self-government and municipal autonomy compatible with the federal structure of that nation they were not only generally cooperative with the military governors, but also strongly supportive of the

latter's efforts in centralizing the insular governmental and educational apparatuses under the control of U.S. officials.[60]

In any event, the Republicans lost to the Federalists by a large margin in the only elections that were held under the military regime, that is the so-called "100 day" municipal elections which went on from October 1899 to February 1900. Regarding the Federal Party, it should first be said that the core of its leadership was also comprised of self-employed professionals and intellectuals, but unlike those in the Republican Party, most of them had been educated in Europe, principally Spain, and though many also expressed a strong admiration for the modern and liberal democratic features of the U.S., they had had little previous contact with this nation and were rather greatly attracted to many aspects of the Spanish culture.[61] Many of the Federalist intellectuals and professionals, moreover, had close--often family--ties to the coffee hacendados. The latter constituted also an important sector of the Federalist leadership, but so did, during this time, many creole sugar cane growers. These groups had great interest in maintaining on the one hand the political and economic power they had achieved with the Spanish Autonomous regime, and on the other, in regaining the lost European markets which had made possible their

economic prosperity. They were indeed also interested in securing the large U.S. market for the coffee and sugar economy. Interestingly, in representing these political and economic interests, the Federal Party sought the full and rapid territorial annexation of the Island to the U.S. as an eventual state of that nation while at the same time it insisted on the largest degree of insular and municipal autonomy for the Puerto Ricans. For the Federalists, as their founding manifesto suggests, there was no fundamental incompatibility with this lagger goal and the former one, indeed they believed that Puerto Rico's incorporation into the U.S. federal structure would enhance the opportunities for the Island in terms of both economic prosperity [62] and political and cultural autonomy. It is important to underline in this connection that the Federalists also favored the "Americanization" of Puerto Rico in the broadest political, economic and cultural sense, and thus, like the Republicans, they consistenly expressed admiration for--as well as the desire to assimilate--the "modern" public educational, liberal democratic, meritocratic and capitalist institutions of the U.S. [63] A position which indeed they maintained even as they became increasingly critical of many of the colonial and "Americanization" policies of the military regime. As shall be seen in the final section of this Chapter, this was particularly the

case with most of their opposition to the educational policies of the military regime.

Another political group that was very active during the first years of U.S. rule in Puerto Rico was the small non-electoral organization known as the League of Patriots.[64] This group served as a vehicle of expression for a significant sector of the Puerto Rican leadership that previously had been militant advocates of the goal of political independence for the Island from Spanish domination. The activities of the League of Patriots reflect the extent of the admiration shared by Puerto Rican leaders of diverse political persuasions for U.S. institutions and values. More important, the political positions of the League of Patriots reveal to a considerable degree the political thought of Eugenio María de Hostos, founder and president of the organization and, as indicated in the previous Chapter, one of the foremost exponents in Puerto Rico--and Latin America--of a liberal democratic and meritocratic conception of society and education. In this respect, it is particularly enlightening to compare the positions of Hostos and the League of Patriots not only with those of the leaders of the Federal and Republican parties but also with the policies of "Americanization" of U.S. colonial administrators.

Apparently, the majority of the Puerto Rican leadership which had favored political independence from Spain now strongly favored full annexation to the U.S. as an eventual state of this nation. Many of the leaders had been educated in the U.S. or had already established commercial links there, and some had even in fact advocated before 1898 the annexation of the Island to the North American republic.[65] Eventually, many of them would join the insular Republican Party, but a few would also collaborate with the League of Patriots. Like those former "separatists", Hostos was a strong admirer of the modern, meritocratic, and liberal democratic institutions of the U.S.;[66] unlike them, however, he would continue to favor political independence for Puerto Rico and until his death in 1903 he would increasingly denounce U.S. colonial policies, anticipating in a sense, for almost a decade, the positions of Rosendo Matienzo Cintrón and a small group of liberal professionals and intellectuals which as will be seen later, founded the Independence Party of 1912. Nevertheless, Hostos' position differed significantly from that of other militant independence advocates, most notably Ramón Emeterio Betances, who strongly rejected U.S. rule over Puerto Rico under any form, by supporting a transitory political status for the Island based on self-government but under the protectorate of the U.S.[67] In his view such

protectorate was to last fifteen to twenty years and it was to be a protectorate of "liberty and progress" in which the people of Puerto Rico were to be "Americanized" in the broadest political, administrative and cultural (and educational) sense, and thus educated for self-government according to the democratic traditions of the U.S.[68] At the end of this preparatory period there was to be a plebiscite in which the people of Puerto Rico were to decide whether they wanted to constitute themselves as a state of the U.S. or as a sovereign republic. In this scheme the League of Patriots was conceived as an organization of political education, integrated by supporters of both statehood and independence and as such it was designed to serve as a principal agency of "Americanization" in the preparation of the Puerto Rican people for democratic self-government whether as a federal state or a sovereign republic.[69]

In a sense, Hostos' insistence on the need to "Americanize" the Puerto Rican people and of educating them for self-government may appear strikingly similar to the rationale given by U.S. authorities to justify the prolongation of the military regime and, subsequently, the centralized colonial structures of the civil regimes of 1900 and 1917. The remarks quoted above of U.S. Secretary of War, Elihu Root, were typical, and so were those of the

last U.S. military governor of the Island, General Davis, who found appropriate "to advert in strong terms to the general unfitness of the great mass of the Puerto Rican people for self government."[70] More will be said later on the "Americanization" policies followed by U.S. authorities regarding public education. What should be pointed out in this context is that apart from the apparent similarities between Hostos' position on "Americanization" and on the protectorship as a preparatory phase for democratic self-government, and those of U.S. colonial authorities, there were important substantive differences in interpretation. The latter would increasingly insist, with the growing support of the insular Republican Party, that such preparatory educational stage required the strong and centralized guiding hand of the U.S. colonial officials while Hostos insisted, like the Federalists, that such preparation for self-government should be principally based on local initiative for it required the direct participation of the people in self-government at both the insular and municipal levels. To limit local initiative and responsibility at either of these levels--as was done for example under the military regime and the civil government after 1900--was seen by the members of the League of Patriots as well as by Federalists as a profound contradiction to what they considered to be the decentralized and democratic traditions

of the U.S. Indeed, while Hostos favored political independence for Puerto Rico, he (like the Federalists) was convinced that the federal and representative character of the various levels of the U.S. government could ensure the autonomy and identity of Puerto Rico as a whole as well as those of its municipalities, even if the Puerto Rican people were to decide eventually to become a state of the U.S.[71]

Apparently, both Hostos and the Federalists were unaware--or greatly underplayed--not merely the actual expansionist colonial thrust of the U.S. but also the centralizing tendencies which as noted earlier in this Chapter, characterized its various political, cultural and economic institutions. It is thus not surprising that a U.S. observer of the Island at the turn of the 20th century could comment on the "naiveness" of leaders like Hostos and the Federalists regarding the actual political and organizational trends of the North American nation. Such was the case of L.S. Rowe, who served as chairperson of a commission appointed by the U.S. government to revise Puerto Rican laws. As he stated in 1904,

> Distorted notions of American political institutions led the (Puerto Rican) population to believe that under American rule every office, insular and local, would be elective, and that the appointment of officials by the home government would be forever abolished... The situation was one of peculiar difficulty, for it was impos-

> sible to convince the natives that their view of the American political system was erroneous... It was useless to point out that the development of local institutions in the United States was marked by a tendency toward centralization, owing to the inability of the local governments to meet those standards of efficiency which the best interests of the State demanded. The natives could not be made to believe that in matters of public education, public charities, and sanitation, state governments were exercising an increasing control over the action of local authorities, nor could they be made to see that the American system, instead of being the extremely decentralized government of the early years of the nineteenth century, was becoming one in which the central government sets standards of efficiency and holds the local authorities to strict account for the maintenance of the standards.[72]

And, approving such tendency of centralization in the U.S., Rowe went on to argue for the need of an even greater degree of centralization of government in Puerto Rico. According to Rowe:

> ... the contact between the two political systems (of the U.S. and Puerto Rico) has resulted in a number of far-reaching changes, designed to make the administrative system of the island more American in character, it has been necessary to retain in the central government sufficient power to guard the local authorities from the results of their own inexperience. This necessity has given to the Insular administration a far more centralized character that is to be found in any of the States of the Union...[73]

In fact, as shall be seen shortly, the U.S. military governors took important steps toward establishing in Puerto Rico an "American" public school system under the firm control of U.S. officials, but it should be advanced

here that the institutionalization and formal centralization of such a system would not be definitely realized until after 1900, that is, until after the imposition of a colonial civil government on the Island by the U.S. Congress.

Educational Developments

In summarizing the educational efforts of the U.S. military regime in Puerto Rico during the 1898-1900 period, the Commissioner of Education for the Island in 1903, Samuel M. Lindsay, made the following remarks:

> With schools in a somewhat disorganized condition, owing to the war and to the change of government and still organized on the Spanish system the school year of 1898-99 began. During this first year the American Military government had to do the best it could with the teachers, school equipment, local school boards and other agencies, as it found them. It put a number of district school inspectors, mostly Americans, in the field and began taking stock and formulating plans. In the summer of 1899 began a period of experiments, with varied success, for the purpose of establishing the American free public school as the basis of Republican government and business prosperity.[74]

To some extent this is a fair summary of the efforts of the military regime regarding public education in the Island, but it says nothing of the growing resistance and criticism from a significant part of the insular elite to

some fundamental aspects of such efforts; an insular elite who initially, it is important to remember, favored on the whole, not only the establishment in Puerto Rico of an "American" and "Americanizing" school system, but more generally the overall "Americanization" of the Island. It appears, indeed, that most of the local leadership--including here not only those who would remain firm supporters of U.S. colonial officials and policies, like for instance the leaders of the insular Republican Party and the local working class organizations (namely the FLT) but also the leadership of the League of Patriots and, particularly, of the Federal Party, who were to become increasingly critical of U.S. colonial rule over the Island--subscribed to many of the clearly pro-American resolutions, specifically those regarding public education, which were adopted by a special assembly of local citizens on October 30, 1899, only twelve days after the Island was officially ceded to the U.S. The resolutions regarding public education read in part as follows:

> As regards public education, the best means of advancing our people would be kindergartens and normal schools as established in the United States. Our elementary and superior schools should be transformed and graded according to modern pedagogic methods. Secondary instruction should be a continuation of the primary and a preparation for the superior and collegiate. Universal education should be introduced on the best models of the United States. There should be established schools for adults, Sunday schools, schools of arts and trades, libraries,

> museums, academies of fine arts, and literary clubs. Education must be obligatory and gratuitous, and it must be compulsory on every municipality to sustain its own schools, the number being fixed by law with reference to the population. If the municipality be unable to sustain all the schools, the state should establish the necessary ones.[75]

Along these lines, moreover, most sectors of the local leadership often echoed the frequently stated claim of U.S. officials that the establishment of an "American" public school system on the Island would be a major--if not the main--factor in "Americanizing" the insular people and hence, in preparing them according to the principles and habits of order, industry and democracy of the "American" civilization.[76] But in spite of such surface agreement in principles and ultimate ends, an increasing number of the insular elites soon became dissapointed with--and to some extent threatened by--the educational policies and measures of the military regime, a disappointment which paralleled their previously noted disillusionment and growing criticism with the political and economic policies and measures of the military regime. A brief look at the latter's educational initiatives is thus now in order.

According to the official reports of the military regime, little attention could be given to Puerto Rico's public school system during the brief administration of the first U.S. military governor--General Brooke--from

October 18 to December 9, 1898, given the chaotic and dislocating conditions resulting from the war and the change in colonial rule, conditions which greatly affected not only the educational system but most other spheres of the insular society, including, as has been seen before, the government and the economy.[77] General Brooke left basically in operation the Spanish school system and laws and though he opened the school system in mid-November, many of the schools remained closed and/or in disarray, a situation which was compounded by the departure of Spanish teachers and by the incapacity of the municipalities to pay the salaries of teachers and other school costs. But during the administration of the second military governor--General Henry--from December 1898 to May 1899, the reorganization of educational affairs in an "Americanizing" direction began to move rapidly and more thoroughly. General Henry's concern for educational matters on the Island can be seen in some of the remarks he made in his first address as governor, remarks which are interesting not only in what they reveal of his educational "Americanizing" goals but also in that they are alleged to be the first public utterances regarding education in Puerto Rico by a U.S. official:[78]

> The system of school education should be looked into, and it is my desire to ascertain how many teachers can be paid who can teach the English

> language, commencing with the younger children. It is believed that those who can speak English only can accomplish the purpose by object lessons. It is thought that American women for teaching can be obtain for $50 a month in gold, and they are well worth it. The young children are anxious to learn, and now is the time for them to do so. If the alcaldes will report to me how many teachers they can employ, they will be brought from the states and set to those towns.[79]

Moreover, shortly after assuming office in January 1899, General Henry brought to the Island the previously mentioned John Eaton, the former and able U.S. Commissioner of Education, now nearly 70 years old, to take charge of educational matters and to study and start the process of adapting and reorganizing the insular public school system according to North American principles and practices. During his short stay on the Island--from January to May 1899--Eaton was to be known successfully as Inspector or Superintendent of Schools, Director of Public Instruction, and Chief of the Bureau of Education,[80] a sequence of titles reflecting the transitional and exploratory character of his administrative and reorganizational efforts. While with all these successive titles Eaton was formally under the head of the insular Department of Interior, an organizational feature which remained from the Spanish Autonomous regime, his recommendations were often quickly enacted into general orders by the military governor, even

against the opposition of the creole (Federalist) Secretary of Interior. It should be noted that such developments reflected the otherwise effective attempts of the military regime in reducing the formerly independent power of the cabinet secretaries of the autonomous government and in subordinating them to the direct control of the military governors, attempts which by the way were opposed particularly by the members of the insular cabinet who belonged to the Federal Party.[81] However, the specific measures suggested and/or implemented by Eaton or by his close assistant and eventual successor, Victor S. Clark, as head of the public educational system generated much wider and stronger opposition and criticism among the insular elite.

Shortly after his appointment, Eaton ordered the purchase of 10,000 primary English reading books and secured the authorization by General Henry of a set of regulations published as a circular on January 19 "requiring that all teachers shall be expected to learn English; that in new appointments teachers speaking English shall be preferred to those not possessing this qualification; that all candidates for diplomas from high schools, normal schools and collegiate institute shall be examined in English."[82] Furthermore, upon recommendation

by Eaton, General Henry ordered the appointment on March 23, of 16 English supervisors of U.S. or English parentage and familiar with the school systems of the U.S., who acted not only as supervisors and teachers of English to local teachers and pupils but also as school inspectors and as recollectors of school data for the insular educational bureau.[83] At the end of the school year, in June 1899, Eaton also ordered the closing of the Institute of Secondary Education and of the normal school for women upon the recommendation of a commission (comprised incidentally by two U.S. army officers and two Puerto Rican members of the strongly pro-U.S. local Republican party) which found those institutions too expensive, pegagogically inadequate and as not measuring up to the standards of instruction in the U.S.[84]

Eaton's culminating activity as head of the insular public school system was the preparation of the first code of school laws under U.S. rule which was promulgated by General Henry during the months of April and May, 1899. These school laws, which according to subsequent U.S. educational officials in Puerto Rico were based largely upon the school system in Massachusetts,[85] provided among other things for the abolition of the fee system and made the public schools free to all residents of the Island between the ages of 6 and 18 years; for the establishment

of a graded system of schools in towns, of coeducational primary schools in the rural districts and of high schools, normal schools and professional schools; the establishment also of the legal qualifications and salaries of teachers; for a course of study which eliminated the teaching of Church doctrine and religion and which adopted as required subjects such as Spanish, English, arithmetic, and geography with the elements of U.S. history and civil government; for free text-books, and for uniform instruction in accordance with teachers' manuals published by the Bureau of Education.[86]

Interestingly, Eaton's school laws also provided for a relatively decentralized educational organization with school districts headed by elected, five-member boards which had the power to appoint primary school teachers, to assess and collect school taxes, and to select, construct, acquire, and pay for primary school buildings and furniture.[87] It should be noted that this section of the school laws was optional and hence, not mandatory, a feature which explains in part why it hardly was implemented on the Island, though one should have in mind, as shall be seen shortly, that there were other reasons for its failure not the least of which was the lack of enthusiasm in implementing them by Eaton's successors as heads of the public school system

under the military regime.[88] Indeed, this lack of enthusiasm was complemented by their actual efforts to centralize the control of the school system in their hands rather than in decentralizing it. In any case, it is important to remember that the decentralizing provisions of Eaton's laws were rather limited, for they were not only circumscribed by the authoritarian and discretionary character of a regime ruled by military orders, but also by the same school laws for in addition to determining the legal qualifications of teachers and the legal courses of study for the whole school system, and of retaining the supervisory authority of the central insular bureau of education and of the so-called English supervisors, gave to such a bureau the power to formulate a uniform system of instruction for all grades of public schools.[89] An important step taken by the military governor--curiously against the advice of Eaton--was to make the payment of the primary school teachers a responsibility of the insular treasury instead of the municipal treasuries,[90] a move which while still allowing the local boards to be in charge of the appointment of teachers and while providing a new major source of funds for financing the expansion of primary instruction, would also serve later, as shall be seen below, as an excuse for the further centralization of the school system in the hands of U.S. colonial officers.

The powers of the central educational agency increased during the remaining period of the military regime, yet as compared to what was instituted under the subsequent colonial civil regimes and to what still exists today, the organization--at least its formal aspects--of the insular school system remained between 1898-1900 rather decentralized. And in fact even with the increasing centralization of power of the insular educational agency, the organization of the school system provided by the military regime allowed for a greater participation of the insular elites in its educational decision-making bodies than the the subsequent civil regimes, and this not only at the local, municipal level through the district school boards, but also at the central level in what was to become the Insular Board of Educatiion. This latter body, which soon was to absorb the functions of the Bureau of Education, was created in July by General Davis, the successor of General Henry in the governorship of Puerto Rico. The Insular Board first consisted of five members and then in December of the same year it was expanded to nine, and in both instances all but two of its members were Puerto Ricans representing the two main local political parties, that is, the Federal and Republican parties, though the President of the Board, who acted at the same time as the insular director of public instruction, remained to be a

U.S. citizen;[91] a position which for the most part of the existence of the board was occupied by Victor S. Clark--from July 1899 to March 1900-perhaps one of the most important architects of Puerto Rico's educational system under U.S. rule and a former close assistant of John Eaton in the Bureau of Education and successor of the latter since May 1899 as head of the Bureau. The Insular Board was constituted as an independent body reporting directly to the military governor and as such it was delegated, as its creator remarked, "wide discretionary power," being accordingly "not merely an advisory body, but the central organizing and administrative power in the system of public instruction, with authority to act in all ordinary matters and to decide upon and follow out a definite and systematic policy in regard to educational affairs."[92]

Throughout the remaining year of the military regime, the Insular Board and, especially, its President, were given additional powers at the expense of the local boards, perhaps the most important being those giving the former the authority to appoint primary school teachers and to rent schools whenever the municipal boards failed to do so,[93] an eventuality which apparently happened frequently for reasons which shall be noted shortly. With such increased power, Clark continued to emphasize Eaton's policy of giving priority to the expansion of primary schooling and

of making it the principal instrument of "Americanization," particularly through the teaching of English and the inculcation of an "American" patriotic spirit. To help finance the school expansion, the military governor imposed a school tax of 1 dollar upon property owners, professionals and artisans, the revenues of which were to be administered exclusively by the central educational authorities.[94] In order to facilitate the intensification of the teaching of English and the introduction of "American" methods and styles of organization and instruction, U.S. teachers--mostly women--were brought to the Island in addition to the previously mentioned English supervisors, while Puerto Rican teachers were sent to the U.S. mainland for a quick immersion in such methods and styles.[95] Furthermore, there was established during Clark's administration--in September 1899--a so-called model and training school in San Juan, with an all U.S. born faculty, and with instruction, extending from kindergarten to high school, given entirely in English.[96] Aside from servicing the former pupils of the now closed Secondary Institute, this school serviced the children of the U.S. military and civil administrators and operated as a training institution for primary school teachers. This, together with a secondary school authorized in Ponce in November 1898 were the only public institutions open during the military regime which offered

courses beyond the primary level, though plans for the establishment in Fajardo of normal school and a high school were also authorized during the latter part of the U.S. military regime.[97] But it should be noted in this context that the stated policy of the military authorities was to subordinate the expansion of post-elementary schools to the growth of the primary school system, a policy, interestingly enough, which they phrased in a highly democratic and egalitarian rhetoric often directed as criticism of the educational demands of the insular elite. Typical of such rhetoric were the following remarks made by Eaton:

> One of these aspirations (of the local elite), much talked about in the island, was the possibility of a university; while it was well known that in the States the greatest value would be placed upon the introduction of those pedagogical features which would yield the greatest results to the largest number, especially given through training in the elements of industry and in the elements of learning, language, English and Spanish, arithmetic, geography.[98]

Curiously, it was not only the emphasis in the expansion of primary education which was presented as democratic and egalitarian but also the emphasis in the mass teaching of English. In a report to Eaton, Clark, then sub-director of public instruction, went so far as to describe such emphasis in class terms, as the democratic response of the U.S. administration to the demands of the common people vis-a-vis the insular elite.

> It was pointed out to me that there might be a tendency upon the part of the wealthy people to monopolize English in their own ranks, and to use it to keep political and commercial control, and as an additional instrument of oppression of lower classes. I think that in some places the common people have a vague idea that English is in some way associated with liberty and political rights, and that there is an earnest effort being made to prevent the people from securing it.[99]

It should be advanced here that the school language policy pursued by U.S. colonial officials in Puerto Rico, and particularly their attempts to intensify the teaching of English and to make this language the language of instruction in schools, would remain for a long time after the military regime, as shall be seen in the next Chapter, their thorniest educational problems in the Island and, in fact, one of the major sources of public controversies and conflicts. Yet, as shall also be seen in that Chapter, throughout all the years of U.S. colonial rule in Puerto Rico, such language policy often varied, and at times considerably, regarding the relative importance given to the use of English in schools. And indeed, even Eaton and Clark modified their views in this respect during their brief administrations. Both wanted to transform rapidly Puerto Rico into and English-speaking U.S. dependency and to

that end they at first attempted to quickly convert most of the school instruction into English. They, like most U.S. educational administrators that succeeded them after the end of the military regime, firmly believed that the intensification in the mass teaching of English was a fundamental aspect of the imminent "Americanization" of the Island. As Eaton put it:

> The absence of the English language furnished the greatest difficulty in the way of those who wished to become Americans in thought, belief and loyalty.
>
> To them, the gaining of the knowledge of English is the medium through which they will become acquainted with the principles of American liberty, with American affairs, American commerce and trade, and thereby share in their (sic) benefits. All that they expect from their new relations must come to them through the English language, in which are to be found American history, literature, art, science, statesmanship, and in the use of which they are to enter into industrial and commercial relations with the business of the States and take a share in the civil administration.[100]

On the other hand, Eaton and especially Clark had a very low regard of the Spanish spoken or previously taught in Puerto Rico. Thus, for example, in advocating the English-language conversion of the Island, Clark remarked:

> ... the majority of the people of this island do not speak pure Spanish. Their language is a patois almost unintelligible to the natives of Barcelona and Madrid. It possesses no literature and little value as an intellectual medium. There is a bare possibility that it will be nearly as easy to educate these people out of their patois into English

> as it will be to educate them into the elegant tongue of Castile.[101]

Soon, however, Eaton and Clark discovered that the process of converting the insular population--particularly the rural one--to the English language would require much more time than they originally envisaged, and that the local Spanish language however unsophisticated they believed it to be, was rather deeply ingrained in the great majority of its people, a situation which was compounded not only by the scarcity of teaching and material resources in the public school system but also by the already mentioned increasing opposition of the local elites to the educational policy and, more generally, to the colonial policies of the military regime. In fact, it should be remembered, that not only were the efforts to intensify English teaching progressing very slowly but so were also the overall efforts to expand primary education, a situation which can be attested from the data provided by the last of the military governors which shows that while at the end of Spanish rule there were 524 public primary schools in Puerto Rico with an attendance of 18,243, at the conclusion of the U.S. military regime two years later there were 587 of those schools and only 19,754 children attending them.[102] Given this overall situation and while still keeping their emphasis in the teaching of English, the U.S. educational

officials under the military regime reluctantly moved toward the adoption of a transitional language policy of bilingualism directed at the conservation of Spanish and the acquisition of English and in which Spanish was generally to remain as the main medium of instruction at least until there were enough competent teachers to teach in English.[103]

In addition to emphasizing the teaching of English, the performance of "American" patriotic exercises and the familiarization with "American" institutions, U.S. educational officials during the military regime also expressed in several occasions their concern for enhancing through education the "productivity" of the Puerto Rican people. As was shown in the previous Chapter, such concerns for using education as a means for increasing the productivity of people had been a typical concern of the Bourbons, and of the local liberal professional, intellectual and artisan classes. Thus the emphasis in this respect in the statements of the military authorities did not represent in itself a radical new departure in educational policy. In point of fact, the emphasis during the military regime did not trascend the rhetorical level for dspite the talk about the importance of manual training and industrial and agricultural education, little if anything was done in this regard during this period; indeed, nothing was even (or could be) done to replace the only trades school operating just before the U.S.

occupation, a school which as noted in the previous Chapter, was closed at the beginning of the Spanish American War, and was destroyed by fire shortly after. But even if little was concretely done in practice regarding manual training or industrial agricultural education, it is worth looking at some of the reasons given by U.S. officials in emphasizing its importance, for it gives us some interesting insights into their mentality and values.

Clark, for instance, in justifying the demand for federal aid for the insular school system often repeated the point that industrial and technical education would not only increase the productive capacity of the Puerto Ricans but also bring other advantages to the U.S. as well:

> We have used the argument elsewhere, that technical and industrial education here will give us a corps of young Puerto Ricans, trained in both the English and Spanish language and in our industrial and commercial methods who will be valuable pioneers in extending our trade in South America. This is the most densely populated Spanish-American country. Many young men will seek fields of labor in South America, and in the other islands of the West Indies. If our government should interest itself in educating them so that they can become the industrial leaders of these countries they ought to accomplish much in extending our commerce and in creating markets for our manufacturers.[104]

Not less interesting was the argument used by Clark in emphasizing the need of industrial education, again in the context of justifying federal aid for education, in a 1900

report. In the case of the illiterate classes of Puerto Rico, according to Clark,

> ... industrial education is what is needed. The three R's, training in the hands, and training in thrift and other phases of self-control be the end toward which Federal aid should look.[105]

Such education, according to him would address the mistakes of the types of education previously furnished to Indians and to Southern blacks. Then citing a report of a school superintendent of Virginia, Clark goes on to illustrate what he considered was wrong with such education and what he thought was needed to correct it:

> The fact is, our common schools are not giving the negro the right kind of education to aid him in becoming a better and more profitable citizen. As I have said above, we have been giving him a smattering of book knowledge that tends to advocate him out of his environment rather than to aid him in making an honest living, and becoming a good and profitable servant of the State. The education that we are giving the negro makes him dissatisfied with the menial pursuits in which his fathers engaged, and in which he must engage if he is to make an honest living and become a useful member of the community in which he lives.[106]

In other words, what was needed to make the illiterate masses of Puerto Rico good "profitable citizens" or "profitable servants of the State" was not "book education," but the "elements of a common school education, practical training in the manual arts and agriculture, and the creation of habits of order and system and thrift."[107]

It is worth remembering that this emphasis at the rhetorical level in manual training and industrial (or agricultural) education was not only hardly backed by any concrete efforts to provide such education but also that the original emphasis in providing the elements of a primary school education to the overwhelming majority of the insular school population--namely, the children of the rural masses--was toned down considerably by the end of the military regime. The rationale for this was well articulated by General Davis, the last of the U.S. military governors of Puerto Rico:

> If today the means existed for supporting the 6,000 schools which would be required to accomodate all the children, and if equitable schoolrooms with necessary equipment existed, I am of the opinion that the attendance would be meager and the result unsatisfactory. The anaemic, half-starved and often naked children would not or could not attend. But supposing the attendance was full and universal... They would learn of wants that could not be supplied,and their miserable surroundings would have added horrors...
>
> After most careful consideration of the question presented, and basing my opinion upon the existing conditions, I am forced to the conviction that the true and wisest policy will be at first to direct the principal effort to educate and elevate the youth of Porto Rico (sic)[108] in these centers of population where there is a state of living, and existing social, industrial, and economic condition that would justify the confident belief, not only that the effort will be supported by public opinion, but that standards and models would be established and copied throughout the island in the rural districts.[109]

It could be seen in these remarks one of the most clearest

justifications for what had been and would be in the future one of the most obvious disparities in the development of schooling, that is, the unequal development of schooling along urban/rural lines; and this despite the attempts of subsequent colonial school officials, as shall be seen in the next Chapter, of closing such a gap for the sake of "Americanizing" the whole insular population. It is worth noting on the other hand, that Davis' openness with respect to what he thought should be U.S. educational policy was matched by his openness with respect to what he thought regarding the situation of the mass of rural laborers. Thus, for instance, he looked with complacency on the abundance of a mass of laborers with low wages at the mercy of the large sugar-cane plantation owners, and his only hope was that eventually some legislation would persuade such sugar magnates of their obligations in improving the living conditions of their employees.[110] Certainly such complacency and faint hopes fit very well with his school policy recommendations: a fit which spelled only continued exploitation and illiteracy for the laboring rural masses.

Ironically, in another report where he repeated the above remarks on school expansion, Davis goes on immediately to criticize Puerto Rico's local ruling wealthy classes, after exempting a "very few farsighted and public spirited men," for their lack of support of "general education."

> The reasons for this are not hard to find. Among them may be mentioned the realization that any direct tax for educational purposes must ultimately be collected from them; the fear of loss of social and financial prestige should education become general; the reluctance to have their children attend to same school as the children of their laborers; and probably most powerful of all, the idea, latent throughout a very large part of the world, that the education of the masses is generally undesirable if not dangerous.[111]

There might have been some truth in the remarks but the criticism was not new and it had even been frequently voiced by some members of the local insular elites against the more conservative sectors of their social strata.[112] Moreover, in the context of his previously noted remark regarding the social and educational future of the popular masses, Davis' criticism seems to be rather hollow. In any event, it should be pointed out that these same reasons--along with others--were used by Davis and Clark to support the need for the centralization of the insular school system in the hands of U.S. officials.

The officials of the military regime acknowledged that the opposition of the Puerto Rican creole elites was not the only reason for their slow progress in implementing their educational plans. They pointed not only to the overall source of political and economic dislocations in the Island caused by the transition from Spanish to U.S. rule, or to the "abject poverty" and "indifference" of the

"considerable mass of ignorant peons,"[113] but also to such exceptional conditions as the devastating hurricane of 1899 which in addition to destroying many of the school buildings, devastated the coffee and sugar plantations, thus reducing substantially, local school tax collections.[114] On the other hand, they were very much aware that the growing resistance and opposition of the local elites to their educational policies did not stem merely from the former's class fear of mass education. They acknowledged, for instance, the local elites' criticism and complaints regarding the discontinuance of Catholic religious instruction in schools, and of the closing of the Institute of Secondary Education; they also were aware of the latter's forceful and frequent criticism of the importation of U.S teachers and the displacement by these (and other people of Anglo American parentage) of the natives from the teaching, supervisory and administrative positions in the public school system.[115] U.S. officials were particularly concerned that this latter criticism was strongly voiced by a growing number of native teachers, who in addition were much annoyed by the military's regime policy of requiring English-language competencies from local teachers, a policy which these thought specifically discriminated against them, threatening, as in the case of the importation of U.S. teachers, their own teaching position

and employment prospects.[116]

The military regime, moreover, was particularly bothered by the fact that these growing criticisms from the teachers were vigorously echoed and supported by leadership of the Federal Party. In this context, it is worth remembering that during the military regime the Federal Party controlled most of the municipal school boards and had also a substantial representation in the insular central board, and from these bodies as well as from their press, its leadership was mounting an increasingly vigorous campaign against the educational plans of the military regime, a campaign which as noted previously, paralleled not only their growing criticism against the political and economic policies of the military government but also the growing annoyance of wider sectors of the insular elites with the delay of Congress in ending the military regime and giving the Island the status of a full, self-governing territory of the U.S.[117] It is also worth repeating at this point that despite the growing frustrations of the Federalists and other sectors of the insular elites with the continuance of the military regime and its policies they still supprted, like the local Republicans, the general "Americanization" of Puerto Rico, and while a few of its members criticized the military

regime from a rather conservative ideological perspective in some respects--e.g., the complaints regarding the discontinuance of Catholic religious instruction and the implementation of co-educational classes--they were for the most part in favor of the assimilation of the liberal democratic and so-called progressive institutions of the U.S. Furthermore, they still favored, like the Republicans the full annexation of the Island to the U.S. as a state of the Union. But as noted in the previous section, the Federalists differed from the military authorities--and from the leadership of the insular Republicans at the time--in that contrary to these, who favored a process of rapid "Americanization" of the Island controlled basically by U.S. officials, the Federalists favored instead a process of gradual "Americanization" in the context of a decentralized, representative regime. Of course, it was their belief that in such political framework they were to have substantial control and influence over the public educational system like over the rest of the political system. The Republicans, on the other hand, could not expect to have such control through the municipal governments and local school boards given that they were still a small electoral minority, but they expected to have some degree of influence through a centralized administrative system in the hands of U.S. officials not just by means of their close collaboration with these officials but also

because as a result of such collaboration they were often appointed in preference to the Federalists to high level bureaucratic positions in the military government.[118]

At any rate, it appears that during the period of the military regime, the opposition of the Federalists was not directed so much against any specific cultural aspect of the "Americanization" policy of U.S. authorities--indeed, during this time, even the military's English-language policy did not present to the Federalists a primary target of criticism as it would in later years--but rather against what they thought were clear attempts by the military officials to displace them from their hegemonic, political, economic and educational positions in the Puerto Rican society, positions which they had gained with the Autonomist government after long struggles against Spanish colonialists and which naively they had expected to consolidate and conserve within the liberal and federal framework of the U.S. Thus the growing criticism of the Federalists and, more broadly, of large sectors of the local elites against the educational policies of the military regime must be seen in the wider socio-historical perspective in which their access to the teaching, supervisory and higher positions of the school bureaucracy, like their access to analogous positions elsewhere in the civil bureaucracy and the economy, were blocked by the new colonial power.

It should be noted in passing that such an apparently liberal and progressive measure as the separation of Church and State, the secularization of public schools and the discontinuance of Catholic religious instruction in schools could have been seen by some members of the insular elites as a decisive step by the military regime in breaking the former's cultural hegemony over Puerto Rico. And indeed the application of the doctrine of separation of the Church and the State, and of the secularization of public schools in Puerto Rico, was not only strongly supported by North American Protestants but more importantly, it was implemented in the Island by Protestant U.S. military governors and educational officials, who sought to facilitate the growth of Protestantism in Puerto Rico.[119] Protestantism was seen by these as an embodiment of "American" individualistic and liberal democratic values, and the missionary work by U.S. Protestants on the Island was seen as complementary to the "Americanizing" programs of the insular public schools. In short, with the strong support of the military regime, Protestantism gained an important foothold in Puerto Rico, from which in the future its influence would spread throughout the Island especially among the rural and urban proletariat, though it should be said, never to the point of displacing the dominant influence of the Catholic Church (which otherwise, it is

also worth knowing in advance, would also fall eventually under the control of the U.S. Catholic hierarchy and serve, as much as the Protestant churches, as important instruments in the cultural "Americanization" of Puerto Rico.[120]

In any event, it is interesting to have in mind that while in subsequent years the Federalist membership would increasingly and frequently defend Catholicism and the Catholic Church against the U.S. sponsored advances of Protestantism, it would hardly do so, except for the few instances mentioned above, during the period of the military regime, when the Federalists still maintained the liberal positions in religious matters which they held during the last years of the Spanish regime, when in addition to supporting the secularization of the State they criticized the conservative positions of the Catholic Church.[121] But thereafter, as shall be seen in Chapter V, as the elite, landowning and professional sectors represented by the Federalists and their political successors (the Unionists) were considerably displaced by the U.S. colonial bureaucracy and U.S. capital from their hegemonic positions in the Island, they would increasingly defend most of the Hispanic cultural legacy, including its most conservative elements, like Catholicism (and Spanish patriarchy), as core expressions of the Puerto Rican culture.

For U.S. officials, however, the Federalists and most of the creole elites were already during the military regime not only highly conservative, class elitist and undemocratic in their political, social and educational attitude but also clearly obstructionist of the former's "Americanization" plans, either through their apathy, "passive resistance," or through their active political interference in the local and the insular school boards.[122] Given such apathy and obstructionism from the part of Puerto Rico's "ruling class," given the mass illiteracy of its population, and given the fact that the insular treasury was already taking charge of most of the local schools as a result of the bankruptcy of most municipalities, the military regime officials went on to argue very forcefully for the full centralized control of the Island's school system in the hands of U.S. authorities. Interestingly, the arguments used in favor of such centralized control over education were the same as those used in favor of the establishment in the Island of a colonial civil regime with little self-government for its population. These arguments could be reduced to one: simply put, that the "natives" had to be educated for self-government, and that such education, as noted previously, could not be efficiently attained through the exercise of self-government itself, that is by entrusting the Puerto Rican people with full autonomy or

self-government in all the spheres of public life, including education, but rather by means of a previous indefinite process of instruction of the masses in the attitudes and views of the "Americans" toward life and government, a process primarily undertaken by an efficient, highly centralized system of public schools under the control of U.S. authorities.[123] It is very doubtful that such colonial and centralized governing structure could have provided any effective education for self-government, the opposite in fact could be argued; nonetheless, as shall be seen in the next Chapter, such a structure was indeed imposed by the U.S. Congress on the Puerto Rican population with the passing in 1900 of the Foraker Act, that is with the end of the military regime and the establishment of the first U.S. civil regime on the Island, to which this study now turns.

FOOTNOTES

[1] The following account of U.S. expansionism during the 19th century and at the turn of the 20th century is based mainly on the following sources: Carroll and Noble (1977), Cruz Monclova (1965), Foner (1972), Healy (1970), LaFeber (1963), Luque de Sánchez (1980), Pratt (1955,1964), Rafucci de García (1981), Trías Monge (1980), Williams (1969,1972,1978,1980), Zinn (1980).

[2] See, for instance, Cruz Monclova (1965:169-172), Trías Monge (1980:136-137), Williams (1980:68-73).

[3] For brief summaries of U.S. expansionist interests in the Caribbean during the 19th century, see Rafucci de García (1981:29-37), and Trías Monge (1980:135-140).

[4] On the principal factors behind U.S. expansionism, see in particular Williams (1969,1980); for brief summaries, Williams (1972:18-27, 1978:34-39).

[5] On the development of the notion of "Manifest Destiny", and the ideologies which sustained it, see Pratt (1964:2-17), Williams (1978:37-39); also Weinberg (1935).

[6] On the political and economic development and structure of the U.S. from the Civil War to the end of the 19th century, see Carroll and Noble (1977:257-298), Collins (1979:73-74), Williams (1978:9-74), Zinn (1980:247-289).

[7] Carroll and Noble (1977:293).

[8] On the "Progressive Era", see Kolko (1977), Spring (1972), and Weinstein (1968; for brief accounts, see Carroll and Noble (1977:287-290), Katz (1971a:113-125), Tyack (1974:126-268), Williams (1978:75-95), and Zinn (1980: 341-349).

[9] On Gompers, see Carroll and Noble (1977:264-265), Zinn (299-301, 320-321).

[10] See Carroll and Noble (287-290), Katz (1971a:114-116), Tyack (1974:167-176).

11

On the historical developments of U.S. education during the 19th century and/or early 20th century, this study has relied on Bowles and Gintis (1977), Butts and Cremin (1953), Callahan (1962), Collins (1979), Cremin (1977,1980), Curti (1978), Katz (1968,1971a,1971b), Nasaw (1981), Spring (1972), Tyack (1974), Warren (1974).

12

On this point, see in particular Collins(1979), Katz (1971a), Tyack (1974), and Warren (1974).

13

See Bowles and Gintis (1977), Curti (1978), Katz (1968,1971a), Nasaw (1981), Spring (1972), and Tyack (1972).

14

On the centralization and bureaucratization of U.S. school systems along corporate lines, see in particular Callahan (1962), Katz (1968,1971a), Spring (1972), and Tyack (1972).

15

On the influence of the Prussian school system on U.S. educational reformers, see Butts and Cremin (1953:219-220,231,243,286) and Warren (1974:33-34).

16

It may be argued with some justification that the "pragmatism" and "social reconstructionism" of John Dewey and his followers was a liberal democratic and egalitarian exception to the line of reasoning that prevailed among educational and political Progressives. Yet, despite the undeniable liberal democratic and egalitarian thrust in Dewey, it could also be argued that his fundamental concern was in achieving, mainly through public education, an orderly and coherent democratic society, guided by scientifically-informed experts. In other words, one can find in Dewey's writings an ideological legitimation of a form of scientific, democratic and socialist society profoundly technocratic and, hence, elitist in character. For critiques of Dewey along these lines, see Karier et al. (1973); for a more sympathetic view of Dewey, see Bernstein (1971) and Cremin (1964).

17

On the N.E.A. and the U.S. Bureau or Office of Education, see Butts and Cremin (1953), Curti (1978), and Warren (1974).

18

The social and educational views of Eaton and Harris are summarized in Curti (1978:211,219,310-347) and Warren (1974:151-173); on Eaton, see also Smith (1969).

19

Curti (1978:336-341), Smith (1969:111-112).

[20] Harris (1899:76).

[21] On U.S. expansionism during the 1890s, see Foner (1972), Healy (1970), LaFeber (1963), Pratt (1955,1964), Williams (1969,1972,1980), Zinn (1980).

[22] Pratt (1955:368).

[23] Quoted in Zinn (1980:291-292).

[24] On this debate and the political developments which served as its background, see Berbusse (1966), Gould (1969), Luque de Sánchez (1980), Pratt (1955), Trías Monge (1980), Williams (1969,1972,1980), Zinn (1980).

[25] Zinn (1980:299-301).

[26] See, for instance, Gould (1969:87,170-171), Williams (1972:46-47).

[27] Gould (1972:88-89,112-114), Pratt (1955), Zinn (1980: 305-313).

[28] U.S. War Department (1899:28-29).

[29] U.S. Senate (1901:7-8).

[30] Clark (1973).

[31] On the position of the Democrats and "Anti-Imperialists", see the references in Footnote 24 above.

[32] On this point, see in particular Williams (1972:45-48; 1978:47-48).

[33] Gould (1972:87), Trías Monge (1980:206).

[34] See Williams (1972:50-57).

[35] The Organic (Foraker) Act enacted for Puerto Rico in 1900 will be discussed in Chapter V.

[36] On the initial reaction of the Puerto Ricans to the U.S. occupation, see Luque de Sánchez (1980:51-81); the attitude of different social sectors of the insular population can be seen in Carroll (1899).

[37] Quoted more extensively in Negrón de Montilla (1979: 2).

38 On the period of the 1898-1900 military regime in Puerto Rico, see Berbusse (1966), Luque de Sánchez (1980: 51-94), Rafucci de García (1981:110-126), Trías Monge (1980:159-185).

39 Trías Monge (1980:166-168).

40 Clark et al. (1930:50), Trías Monge (1980:180-181).

41 Trías Monge (1980:170).

42 Berbusse (1966, Trías Monge (1980:165-166).

43 Trías Monge (1980:167,169).

44 Bergad (1978:75-76), Gould (1972:67-68), Quintero Rivera (1974a:106-107).

45 Gould (1972:68), Luque de Sánchez (1980:63), Trías Monge (1980:68).

46 Luque de Sánchez (1980:66-70), Quintero Rivera (1974a: 107-108).

47 Berbusse (1966:93-94).

48 Picó (1981a:36-37).

49 Bergad (1978:78).

50 Bergad (1978:78), Quintero Rivera (1974a:105-106).

51 Bergad (1978:82), Quintero Rivera (1974a:105).

52 On insular, political parties, party politics and political movements during the military regime, see Berbusse (1966), Bothwell (1979, I-I:25-26), Luque de Sánchez (1980), Negrón Portillo (1981), Pagán (1959, Vol.I), Rafucci de García (1981), Trías Monge (1980:172-181).

53 Clark (1975:165), Ramos de Santiago (1970b).

54 On the social composition of the political parties of this period, see Negrón Portillo (1981), Quintero Rivera (1976a), and Ramos (1980).

55 Quintero Rivera (1975a:54-55), Ramos (1980:261).

56 Quintero Rivera (1976a:70-71), Ramos (1980:261).

57 Quintero Rivera (1975a:55-56).

58 See, for instance, the two manifests of the Republican Party included in Bothwell (1979, Vol. I-I:259-265).

59 Bothwell (1979, Vol. I-I:261).

60 Berbusse (1966:205,216), Luque de Sánchez (1980:147).

61 See Negrón Portillo as quoted by Mattos Cintrón (1980: 180); on the Federalist leadership, see also Negrón Portillo and Quintero Rivera (1976a).

62 The Federalists' founding manifesto and first political program are included in Bothwell (1979, Vol. I-I: 266-272).

63 See Bothwell (1979, Vol. I-I:266-272), Negrón Portillo (1981:36-51).

64 On the Puerto Rican League of Patriots ("Liga de Patriotas Puertorriqueños"), see Hostos (1939), Luque de Sánchez (1980:70-77), Rafucci de García (1981:114-120).

65 Mattos Cintrón (1980:38-39), Quintero Rivera (1976a: 25-26).

66 On Hostos' admiration of U.S. institutions--albeit his increasing criticism of U.S. colonial policies in Puerto Rico--see his Madre Isla (1939).

67 Hostos (1939:22).

68 Hostos (1939:22,32-33,87-88,147-150).

69 Hostos (1939:32-33,147-150).

70 Quoted in Berbusse (1966:98).

71 This position is often repeated or implied throughout Hostos (1939).

72 Rowe (1904:153-155).

73 Rowe (1904:158).

74 Lindsay (1903:72).

75 Carroll (1899:789).

[76] For the position of the Republicans and Federalists in this respect, see Bothwell (1979, Vol.I-I:261,268-269); for that of the League of Patriots, see Hostos (1939:36-37,192-195).

[77] See, for instance, U.S. House of Representatives (1902:124), U.S. Senate (1900:20).

[78] Osuna (1949:129).

[79] U.S. House of Representatives (1901:221).

[80] Negrón de Montilla (1970:7).

[81] Berbusse (1966:91-92).

[82] U.S. Senate (1900:22).

[83] U.S. House of Representatives (1902:125); also Osuna (1949:143).

[84] U.S. Senate (1900:22-26).

[85] See, for instance, U.S. House of Representatives (1900c:748).

[86] U.S. House of Representatives (1900a:665-677).

[87] See Part I of the 1899 school laws in U.S. House of Representatives (1900a:665-672); also House of Representatives (1902:126).

[88] In fact, there was even strong reservations even among U.S. colonial authorities regarding the appropriateness of the laws for conditions in Puerto Rico see, for instance Negrón de Montilla (1970:7-8), U.S. House of Representatives (1900a:499-500).

[89] See Part II, Section IV of the 1899 school laws in U.S. House of Representatives (1900a:673-674).

[90] U.S. Senate (1900:27).

[91] Negrón de Montilla (1970:11), Osuna (1949:132-133).

[92] U.S. House of Representatives (1902:127).

[93] U.S. Senate (1900:29-30).

94 U.S. Senate (1900:29-30).

95 U.S. Senate (1900:42).

96 U.S. House of Representatives (1900a:643), U.S. Senate (1900:36).

97 U.S. Senate (1900:37).

98 U.S. House of Representatives (1901:248).

99 U.S. House of Representatives (1901:224-225).

100 U.S. House of Representatives (1901:236,238).

101 U.S. Senate (1900:60).

102 U.S. House of Representatives (1902:129).

103 Fife and Manuel (1976:112), Osuna (1949:341-342), U.S. Senate (1900:51).

104 Quoted in Berbusse (1966:214); a similar remark is made by Clark in U.S. Senate (190:51).

105 U.S. Senate (1900:52); another remark by Clark along the same lines is found in U.S. House of Representatives (1900a:654).

106 U.S. Senate (1900:52). Emphasis by author.

107 U.S. Senate (1900:53).

108 "Porto Rico" was the official though distorted name that U.S. authorities applied to Puerto Rico since the Treaty of Paris in 1899 up to 1932.

109 U.S. Senate (1900:5).

110 Luque de Sánchez (1980:44-45,48-49).

111 House of Representatives (1902:133-134); for a similar criticism by Clark, see U.S. House of Representatives (1900a:654).

112 See, for instance, Brau (1972:61,117-118).

113 U.S. House of Representatives (1902:133).

114 Clark (1899:231-232).

115 Berbusse (1966:211-216), U.S. House of Representatives (1900a:655; 1901:246,262-263), U.S. Senate (1900:7).

116 Berbuse (1966:212).

117 Berbusse (1966:216).

118 Negrón Portillo (1981:50).

119 On the separation of Church and State, and the influence of Protestantism during the first years of U.S. rule in Puerto Rico, see Berbusse (1966:200-202), Colón Rosado (1981:142-152), Pantojas García (1974).

120 This will be discussed more extensively in Chapter V.

121 Negrón Portillo (1981:28-30,78-79).

122 See, for instance, the complaints of Military Governor Davis in U.S. House of Representatives (1902:132, 134).

123 U.S. House of Representatives (1900a:655-656; 1902: 132-134), U.S. Senate (1900:45-46); on this respect, see also Clark (1973).

C H A P T E R V

SCHOOL, POLITICS AND THE ECONOMY: THE U.S. COLONIAL CIVIL REGIMES, 1900-1930

The Colonial Apparatus and Party Politics

After much public debate in the U.S., and in spite of the strong opposition from Puerto Rican leaders of all political persuasions and from the metropolitan Democratic Party, the Republican administration in Washington passed through Congress the Foraker Act of 1900, the first Organic Act for Puerto Rico under U.S. rule.[1] It imposed on the Island a civil government with a clear-cut colonial status that concentrated political power in the hands of North American officials directly responsible to the U.S. government in Washington. Under the Foraker Act the U.S. president appointed the governor, the Executive Council and the justices of the insular supreme court. The Executive Council had both executive and legislative duties, serving on the one hand as the governor's cabinet, six of whose members also served as heads of executive departments--including the Department of Education--and on the other hand as the upper house of a bicameral legislature. The lower house, the House of Delegates, was composed of 35 men

elected by the insular male population from among those who paid property taxes or who could read and write in Spanish or English. The legislative power of this elected body was however highly restricted not only in the sense that it had to share such power with the presidentially appointed Executive Council, since both houses had to approve all legislation but also in that all laws were subject to the governor's veto and to Congressional annulment. The Foraker Act also provided for an elected delegate of the Island--the Resident Commissioner--to the U.S. House of Representatives but this delegate had no vote in Congress.

The Foraker Act did not include a Bill of Rights, but a law formally providing for such rights, recognizing for instance, the basic liberal democratic liberties of freedom and speech, assembly, association and press, was enacted by the insular legislature in 1902.[2] Regarding suffrage, the Foraker Act left in effect the order of the military governors which had restricted voting rights to males over 21 years who were literate and paid taxes, but in 1904 the insular legislature promulgated universal suffrage for males 21 years and older.[3] In addition, in 1902 workers were recognized the right to organize, including the right to form labor associations and unions to protect and promote their interests.[4] Interestingly, the Foraker Act did not grant U.S. citizenship to Puerto Ricans, rather, it

declared them "citizens of Puerto Rico", and as such, under the protection of the U.S. In other words, Puerto Ricans were proclaimed citizens of a legal entity subject to Congressional power that lacked U.S. constitutional protection, self-government and international recognition.[5]

It is worth having in mind in this context that the centralized and colonial political structure prescribed by the Foraker Act was in a sense superimposed over insular legislative and municipal institutions which were, even before the U.S. occupation, elitist, classist, patriarchal, and, overall, hierarchical in character, and continued to be so after 1900, even though they were formally representative bodies elected by popular male suffrage. For the most part, as was noted in the previous Chapter, and as shall also be seen later in this section, these representative bodies were controlled and monopolized by, with few exceptions, bourgeois, professionals or intellectuals, who along with or in spite of their liberal democratic ideals commonly engaged in patronage and highly personalistic-authoritarian politics. Thus the few democratic and self-governing elements provided by the Foraker Act were checked not merely by its overwhelming colonial features but also by the patriarchal, classist, hierachical and prebendary features which permeated local politics. To a large degree these latter features would persist to the present day,

and much so during the second civil colonial regime that was to be established by the U.S. in Puerto Rico in 1917. More will be said on this new regime shortly.

Regarding the Foraker Act, it should be mentioned that in 1901 the U.S. Supreme Court gave constitutional endorsement to the colonial status which that Act decreed for Puerto Rico. In a series of decisions--the so-called "insular cases"--the court declared Puerto Rico an "unincorporated territory" of the U.S., proclaimed the constitutionality of the Foraker Act and thus, the capacity of Congress to legislate at its discretion over the Island without extending to the Islanders U.S. citizenship or other protections of the federal Constitution.[6]

The Foraker Act said little on municipal governments, but its dispositions and the legislation enacted subsequently under its framework provided the basis for still greater restrictions on municipal autonomy and for the greater centralization of the insular government.[7] It gave the insular legislature the power to create, consolidate and reorganize the municipalities as well as to enact or annul laws and orders affecting them. It also forbade the municipalities (as well as the insular government) from incurring a total indebtness of over seven percent of the local property tax; and it centralized the power to grant public or semi-public franchises and privileges in the

Executive Council, subject to the approval of the governor and the U.S. Congress. Also, under the Foraker Act, governors could make appointments to fill up interim vacancies in elective municipal posts, a power that the colonial governors used extensively.[8] Subsequent laws, moreover, abolished the municipal police force and created a centralized police force directed by a chief named by the governor. Another law centralized the tax-revenue system in the hands of the insular treasurer, thus limiting further the tax collecting faculties of the municipalities.[9]

In addition, as was anticipated in Chapter IV, the Foraker Act and the legislation enacted later within its framework centralized the public educational system to a much higher degree than that realized under the military regime, concentrating considerable power in the position of the head of the public educational system--the Commissioner of Education--, and leaving the municipal governments with practically no control over educational matters. The last section of this Chapter will elaborate on this point.

Presently, it is worth noting that despite the frequent petitions from the principal political parties for major reforms of the Foraker Act--including demands, as shall be seen later in the discussion of the evolution of those parties, for the granting of economic protection for local agricultural producers and exporters, for greater self-

government and even for statehood and the extention of U.S. citizenship to Puerto Ricans--and despite their growing frustration with the enduring colonial regime which this organic law sanctioned, the latter remained in effect for 17 years. The only important modification to the Foraker Act made during these years was the one in 1909 curbing the budgetary powers of the lower house of the insular legislature, then completely controlled by the Unionist Party, a descendent of the Federalist Party.[10] To force the U.S. Congress to consider some reforms to the colonial regime, the House of Delegates refused to pass appropriations for the 1910 budget, but Congress quickly retaliated by amending the Foraker Act, allowing the Island's executive to appropriate the previous year's budget whenever the insular legislature failed to pass a new one, a measure which in fact reduced even more the already very limited political powers of the elected house of the legislature and, thus, of the local elite.

However, with the 1912 victory in the U.S. of the Democratic Party, the prospects for reforms of the Foraker Act appeared more likely. The Democrats had often criticized the imperialistic policies of the Republican Administration in Washington, and had repeatedly promised that they would grant more autonomy to the U.S. overseas possessions.[11] The Democratic victory raised considerably

the expectations of the local elite that reforms in the Foraker Act were imminent, and this at a time, as shall be seen later, when frustrations within the colonial regime and the nationalist sentiments among the insular elite were at a high point, a situation greatly exacerbated by, on the one hand, the several attempts of Congress during these years to impose on the Islanders collective U.S. citizenship without extending to them at the same time greater self-rule and territorial status under the U.S., and on the other hand, the attempts by the colonial educational officials between 1907 and 1915 to carry to an extreme the policy of using English as the language of instruction in public schools, a policy of which more will be said in the last section of this Chapter.

In any event, while during the Democratic Administration the U.S. Congress began in effect hearings to amend the Foraker Act, and while the U.S. President--Wilson--appointed as governor of the Island a colonial administrator--Yager (1913-1921)--who established relatively good relationships with the dominant insular party (i.e. The Unionists), no reforms were actually made until 1917.[12] These came in the form of the Jones Act, the second organic law passed by Congress for Puerto Rico, which granted collective U.S. citizenship for the Islanders while making only marginal changes toward insular self-government.[13]

It is worth having in mind that this Act was enacted at a time in which war with Germany was imminent and when it appeared to U.S. officials and political leaders that the granting of U.S. citizenship and greater self-government to the Puerto Ricans would not only pacify their growing frustrations with Washington but also ensure their deep loyalty during the war, aside of course of the support they were to get in any case by the fact that as U.S. citizens the Islanders were to be subject to the military draft.[14]

Altogether the concessions of U.S. citizenship and the political reforms made by the Jones Act did little to change the colonial status of the Island. To be sure, the Jones Act provided for some greater measure of self-government in the insular legislative branch by making the upper house--now the Senate--an elected body and by separating from this body the Executive Council, thus relieving the governor's cabinet of its legislative power. However, in spite of such expanded scope for liberal democratic representation and legislative autonomy, the Jones Act continued to place considerable restrictions on self-government. Under the Jones Act the U.S. Congress retained its power to legislate over Puerto Rico and to annul any law passed by the insular legislature. Also, the Jones Act not only continued to give the U.S. President the prerogative to appoint the insular governor but in

addition it gave the former the unconditional power to veto any insular legislation passed over the veto of the governor. In this connection, it is appropriate to remember that despite the granting of U.S. citizenship to the Islanders the Jones Act did not grant them the right to vote in the U.S. presidential and Congressional elections; the only elected insular representative to Congress continued to be the Resident Commissioner which as noted previously was a non-voting member of the House of Representatives.

Significantly enough, while the Jones Act gave the insular governor the prerogative to appoint most members of the executive cabinet with the advise and consent of the insular Senate, it left as presidential appointees the positions of Auditor, Attorney General and Commissioner of Education. Apparently, this measure responded to the interest of the government in Washington of retaining direct control over strategic branches particularly those in charge of the cultural and legal "Americanization" of the Puerto Ricans.[15] It should be noted that apart from continuing to be under the direct control of Washington, the Department of Education, as shall be elaborated in a later section, would become even more centralized and bureaucratized after the enactment of the Jones Act.

With respect to municipal governments, on the other hand, the Jones Act, like the Foraker Act before it, said little, but it should be pointed out that under its framework the municipalities continued to lose decision-making power to the growing centralized bureaucracy of the insular government, a tendency not only evident in the realm of public education but also in such aspects as in the governor's power to appoint municipal officials or in the restrictions placed on municipal budget autonomy.[16]

Differently from the Foraker Act, the Jones Act included, along with the extension of U.S. citizenship to Puerto Ricans, a Bill of Rights, raising thus to a higher level of legal guarantees the civil rights already provided by the insular legislature during the first U.S. civil regime. Universal male suffrage continued to be in effect during the regime constituted by the Jones Act, but it is worth adding here that in 1929 a law was passed by the insular legislature extending voting rights to women who could read and write, rights that would be exercized for the first time in the 1932 election. And it would not be until 4 years later, that is in 1936, when women would attain universal suffrage. More will be said later on the social forces and factors contributing to the achievement of women suffrage in Puerto Rico. But first in order is a brief overview of the evolution of local political forces

since the passage of the Foraker Act in 1900.

Both insular Republicans and Federalists, as well as most of the Island's elite, were disillusioned with the colonial restrictions of the Foraker Act, but they continued to differ sharply in their political attitudes and orientations toward U.S. colonial officials and policies.[17] The Republicans reaffirmed their demand for the immediate incorporation of Puerto Rico as a full U.S. territory followed by statehood, and for the most part of the following three decades, continued to maintain very cooperative relationships with U.S. officials in the Island, especially with those named by continental Republican presidents. Its leadership and its main electoral support continued to come from urban groups associated particularly with the sugar industry and the export-import sector with primary business ties in the U.S. But the composition and character of these Republican groups changed as the agro-export-import economy became increasingly dominated by U.S. capital, especially by large U.S. sugar corporations, a process of capital and land concentration that will be examined in more detail in the next section.[18] However, here it should be advanced that this process of colonial capitalist growth and concentration resulted in the proliferation in the agro-export-import sectors not only of clerical and managerial occupations, but also of professional

ones (e.g. lawyers, engineers, agronomists, chemists and accountants). Apart from these groups, the Republican Party gained the strong backing of the large U.S. sugar corporations while maintaining at the same time the strong support of the few local sugar landowners who prospered under U.S. colonial rule. Another group who were strong supporters of the Republicans, the U.S. oriented importers, increased in economic and political importance especially as the insular economy and best agricultural lands were increasingly dominated by absentee corporate concerns specializing in the production of export crops (mainly sugar and tobacco), a development by which the Island became increasingly dependent on the importation of food and other basic goods.

But while the Republican Party received the increased backing from the professionals, managers, technocrats and other white collar workers employed or linked otherwise to the U.S. oriented agro-export-import sector, it lost progressively the backing not only of the organized urban working class sectors, which as noted in the previous Chapter had initially supported them to some degree, but also of a considerable number of the independent or self-employed professionals which, as also noted before, constituted originally the core of the party's leadership. The professionals in particular became increasingly disillus-

sioned with the colonial civil regime which resulted from the Foraker Act as well as with the unconditional support given by the Republican Party to the officials and policies of this regime. And in 1904 many of these professionals, led by Rosendo Matienzo Cintrón, left the Republican Party and joined the Federalists in the formation of a new political organization, the Union Party,[19] which would dominate electoral politics in Puerto Rico for the next 20 years.

However, from 1900-1904, the local Republicans dominated insular electoral politics and were in control of the lower house of the insular legislature. They achieved this dominance relatively easily given the fact that the Federalists boycotted the 1900 elections and participated only reluctantly in the 1902 elections. In the 1900 elections the Federalists alleged, among other things, that the electoral districts arranged by the U.S. governor and Executive Council favored the Republicans. Moreover, during this period the Federalists--along with the major labor organization, the FLT--were subjected to several mob-like attacks ("turbas"), apparently organized by some Republican leaders, and permitted by U.S. authorities.[20] Notwithstanding this persecution and their weakened political position, and despite the fact that between 1900-1904, they continued to favor strongly U.S. statehood for the

Island, the Federalists attacked vigorously the colonial character of the civil regime organized by the Foraker Act. Interestingly enough, they attacked the colonial regime as essentially un-American, for it limited considerably insular self-government and municipal autonomy while it failed to give the Islanders U.S. citizenship and to its agro-producers secure access to the U.S. market or protection from takeovers by U.S. corporations.[21]

The formation of the Union Party in 1904, a merger as noted above, of Federalists and the small group of dissident Republicans led by Matienzo Cintrón, reflected the increased frustration of wide section the insular upper classes, especially the landowning and liberal, self-employed professional sectors, with the maintenance of the Foraker Act and the colonial structure and policies that this organic law sanctioned. The Union Party was a sort of anticolonial, united political front in favor of self-government and municipal autonomy, and it represented an important departure in local electoral politics in that it was the first party that included independence in its platform as one of the acceptable "status" solutions for the Island. Though the 1904 platform also included statehood and self-rule (or autonomy) under the U.S. flag, and while these latter two would be preferred up to 1913 as status options, the new platform nevertheless marked a

shift away from the former exclusive insistence on full incorporation to the U.S., to a consideration of various political status possibilities.[22] Moreover, after 1904, the pro-independence faction in the Union party grew considerably in number and influence as a result of the continuing indifference of Washington to the repeated pleas of the Unionists for a greater self-government, pleas which interestingly enough included petitions for statehood as well as for the extension of U.S. citizenship to the Puerto Rican people, and as it became increasingly evident not only that the U.S. was consolidating its political and cultural power over the social sectors represented by the Union Party, but also that U.S. corporations were already controlling most of the coastal agricultural lands of the Island.[23] As suggested before, the pro-independence faction gained strength especially after the 1909 budget impasse in the Unionist controlled House of Delegates, and was further fueled by the various attempts of Washington to impose collective U.S. citizenship without additional reforms in the colonial features of the Foraker Act, as well as by the extreme English language policy carried out during the same period in the public schools. Though more will be said on this latter policy in the last section of this Chapter, it should be noted now that it generated a strong wave of protests not only within the

ranks of the Unionist Party but also among a considerable number of teachers, who under the leadership of the recently organized Puerto Rico Teachers' Association (1911), vigorously advocated the re-establishment of Spanish as the language of instruction in public schools[24]--a struggle which, it should also be mentioned in passing, the Teachers' Association continued with great fervor for the following three decades until 1949 when Spanish was finally made the official language of instruction of public schools in Puerto Rico.

The protests generated by the language policy and the other colonial policies of the period were in great measure a reflection of the growing nationalist sentiment in the Unionist Party characterized by the rejection of "Americanization" and the defense not only of the Spanish language but of the whole Hispanic heritage of the Island, including among other things, Hispanic Catholicism and patriarchal traditions.[25] But it is worth mentioning that not all the embryonic nationalist forces or pro-independence supporters within the Unionist Party based their positions on a nostalgic, conservative defense of the Hispanic heritage of the Island. A case in point was the already referred to group of self-employed professionals led by Rosendo Matienzo Cintrón who, in 1904 left the Republican party and joined the Federalists in the formation of the

Unionist Party. Over the years and within the ranks of the latter, this group had become more militant in denouncing U.S. imperialist and "Americanization" policies in Puerto Rico and in defending the political, economic and cultural sovereignty of the Island; a denunciation and defense grounded, interestingly enough, on liberal democratic, meritocratic, anti-monopolistic, and even pro-labor and cooperativist principles derived from U.S. and European traditions.[26] Repudiated as "radicals" by the influential leader--Luis Muñoz Rivera--and the majority of the Unionist Party, Matienzo Cintrón and a small number of these professionals founded in 1912 the Partido de la Independencia, the first strictly pro-independence party in Puerto Rico. Notwithstanding the fact that this party was unable to group any significant forces, and that it disappeared with the death of Matienzo Cintrón in 1913, it triggered nevertheless a political shift in the Unionist Party which in an attempt to re-absorb the pro-independence forces led by Matienzo Cintrón and to bank on the growing nationalist sentiment of the period, dropped from its program the statehood alternative as an acceptable political status and declared the option of independence as its primary long-term goal.[27]

In spite of this shift in their political program and despite the fact that between 1914 and 1917 a majority of

the Unionist leadership repudiated the acquisition of U.S. citizenship, the dominant thrust of this party was toward demanding the extension of greater political autonomy for Puerto Rico within the framework of the U.S. federal government, and while independence was presented as its ultimate goal it appears that this and the forces behind it were used, at least by its most influential leader, Muñoz Rivera, only as a bargaining element for obtaining autonomist concessions from Washington.[28] Following its moderate reformist line, the Unionists welcomed in 1917 the extension to Puerto Ricans of U.S. citizenship and the small additional features of self-government, even though previously, they had rejected such citizenship because it had not been accompanied by greater self-rule for the Island. For sure, neither the Unionists nor, for that matter, the Republicans were satisfied with the small political reforms achieved with the Jones Act, and both in fact renewed their demands for more substantial liberal democratic reforms which for the former meant greater autonomy, while for the latter it continued to mean statehood.

In any event, a few years later, in 1922 the Unionists dropped the plank of eventual independence from its program, adopting as its final goal the status of autonomy in association with the U.S. This step, reaffirming the

Unionist moderate reformist line, was in response to a conjunction of contemporary developments;[29] namely: (1) a recently elected Republican administration in Washington and a newly appointed continental Republican governor (Reily) in the Island, both characterized by their open hostility to the pro-independence groups in Puerto Rico; (2) the growth of the annexionist forces among the insular elites (both autonomists and pro-statehood) reflecting to some degree their increasing integration into the U.S. oriented economy and the colonial administrative apparatus; and (3) the dramatic growth of the labor movement under the leadership of the basically annexionist Socialist Party, of which more will be said shortly.

The decision of the Unionists to drop the "eventual independence" plank from its program led a group of its pro-independence members to split from the party and to form in 1922 the Nationalist Party.[30] This party would never have more than a small following--mainly from the professional and propertied bourgeoisie, but over the years, especially during the 1930s under the personalistic leadership of Pedro Albizu Campos, it would become a strongly militant organization advocating the violent destruction of U.S. imperialism in Puerto Rico and the formation of a republic of small proprietors. Its basic orientation was informed by a highly conservative petty

bourgeois ideology, characterized moreover by its strong admiration for the patriarchal Catholic and Hispanic traditions of the Island. As such, the Nationalist party would become a major political sector during the 1930s, deeply influencing political events and developments during that period. However, during the last decade which is of concern to this study, that is, the 1920s, the Nationalist party made no particular headway except for the fact that being a split from the Unionist party, it contributed, along with the other factors mentioned above, to a new realignment of political forces in 1924. The Unionists, alarmed on the other hand, by the growth of the pro-statehood electoral forces and the possible alliance between the pro-statehood, Republicans and Socialist leaders, and, on the other, by the increasing strength of the labor forces under the leadership of the Socialist party, actively sought and succeeded in forging a coalition with the wealthy, conservative majority of the leadership of the Republicans, and formed a new political organization, the Alianza Puertorriqueña (Puerto Rican Alliance) with a reformist plank calling for more self-government.[31] The Alianza won the 1924 and 1928 elections, thus securing for the Puerto Rican propertied and professional classes, with its pro-statehood and autonomist sectors now temporarily united under the Alianza umbrella, control during most of

the rest of the 1920s both over the insular legislative and municipal bodies, as well as joint political influence over the colonial governor in the distribution of political patronage in the colonial bureaucracy. However, during this time the Alianza did not obtain any concessions from Washington in the direction of greater self-government; moreover, the 1928 elections left the party considerably weakened, winning by only a slight majority in comparison to its overwhelming victory in the 1924 elections, and soon after most of the ex-Unionists left the alliance, founding later in 1931 a new, moderately pro-independence organization, the Liberal Party, a move that would lead to a new realignment of political forces in the Island whose development falls out of the period of concern of this study. However, before leaving the former Unionists, it is relevant to note in this context that both as a wing of the Alianza throughout the 1920s, and later as the core of the Liberal Party during the 1930s, the ex-Unionists assumed a cultural nationalist position which was most explicitly and vigorously expressed in their criticism of the "Americanization" policies of the insular educational authorities and in their defense of the use of Spanish as the language of instruction of public schools.[32]

The third major political force during the time covered by this Chapter were the FLT (Federación Libre de Trabaja-

dores) and its political arm, the Socialist Party, the former organized in 1899 and the latter in 1915.[33] The FLT became over the years the most important labor organization in Puerto Rico, dominating almost exclusively labor unionism from the turn of the century up to the 1930s. In its beginnings it was mainly a federation of local artisan groups, but gradually it began to incorporate the increasingly proletarized urban workers, particularly those in the expanding tobacco industry while later on, especially during the 1910s, it recruited a large sector of the masses of proletarized workers in the spreading sugar plantations and sugar mills. During its first years, the FLT encountered numerous difficulties in its organizing efforts, chiefly among them being, perhaps, the persecution and harassment to which it was subjected by the colonial authorities--both under the military regime and the first governors of the civil regime--as well as by the representatives of the local bourgeoisies both in the Federal party (during the military regime) and the Republican party (during the early civil regime). Notwithstanding this harassment, most of the leadership of the FLT assumed from the beginning a firm position in favor of annexation and the "Americanization" of the Island, vigorously emphasizing those aspects of the North American tradition leading to the extension of civil and labor rights--freedom of speech,

assembly and trade union organizing--, universal male suffrage and mass public education. To some extent, their annexationist, pro-Americanization and, indeed, anti-nationalist positions reflected the great influence which the internationalism of the 19th century socialist and anarchist movements had on the leadership of the local labor groupings. However, their anti-nationalism was greatly reinforced by their justified fears of an independent Puerto Rico ruled by a local bourgeoisie which, as represented by both the Federalists-Unionists and Republican parties, frequently supported the anti-labor position and repressive measures of the local colonial authorities. In the face of this and given their numerical weakness at the turn of the century, the FLT sought the solidarity of the U.S. labor movement, a move which succeeded especially in getting the backing of Samuel Gompers, influential leader of the rather conservative, craft-unionist and even pro-imperialist American Federation of Labor, to which the FLT was affiliated since 1901 and which left a deep organizational and ideological mark on the FLT leadership. Moreover, with the help of Gompers and the AFL, the FLT also occasionally resorted directly to the federal government in seeking protection not only against the local bourgeoisie and U.S. corporations but also against the insular colonial authorities. This tactic

reflected the view held by the majority of the leadership of the FLT throughout its existence, that Washington was not responsible for the anti-labor positions of its colonial authorities, nor of the massive penetration in the Island of the labor-exploitative U.S. corporations; but on the contrary, that it was the chief guarantor and protector of the liberal democratic and labor rights of the Puerto Rican masses. On the whole, then, the relationship with the AFL and their enduring faith in the liberal democratic institutions of the U.S., a faith reinforced by the concrete advances in civil liberties--e.g. free assembly, press, labor unions, universal male suffrage--achieved under U.S. rule, strengthened those tendencies in the FLT favoring annexation and "Americanization". Illustrative of this is the fact that the FLT became one of the most vigorous supporters of the extension of U.S. citizenship to Puerto Ricans and, interestingly enough, of the teaching of English in public schools, for the former was seen by the FLT leadership as a firmer guarantee of their civil liberties and labor rights, while the teaching of English was seen, along with the expansion of public primary education, as providing the working classes as a whole equal educational opportunities, and through these, greater opportunities for political participation and socio-economic progress.[34] In addition, the relationship

of the FLT with AFL and Washington tempered the former original radical democratic, socialist and anarchist ideals and over time it became more reformist, bureaucratic, and trade unionist and less confrontational in its approach, a tendency reflected, for instance, in the emphasis given in the 1920s and particularly in the 1930s to such tactics as "industrial peace", collective negotiation and electoral alliances with the Republican Party or some of the latter's factions.

Such electoral alliances were made through the Socialist Party which since its foundation in 1915 was for all practical purposes the political arm of the FLT. It should be observed that participation in electoral politics was one area in which the North American AFL and the FLT strongly differed for since its beginning, the latter was directly involved in one way or another in Puerto Rican politics while the former's position was generally that of not taking partisan stance in electoral politics and even less that of forming its own political movement. In effect, the FLT had already in 1899 founded a political organization, the Socialist Workers' Party (Partido Socialista Obrero), however, this party existed mostly on paper only, participating just occasionally in insular elections, mainly at the municipal level. One of the main reasons for the creation of this party had been to secure

the independence of the FLT from the politics of both the Republican and Federal parties; however, given their organizational weakness and the violent attacks to which it was subjected at the time by the previously mentioned Republican organized mobs, the FLT and its political arm supported the Federalists in the 1902 elections, an alliance that was stregthened in 1904 as the Federalists now transformed into the Unionists included in their electoral ballot for the House of Delegates various labor candidates. This alliance was strategically convenient for the Unionists, for with the approval of universal male suffrage in the 1904 elections, they could now appeal for the workers vote, a vote which may have been indeed a major factor for the overwhelming victory of the Unionists in these elections and which resulted in fact in the elections of six labor representatives in the insular legislature, the first time it had ever happened in Puerto Rican history. But the alliance between the Unionists and the labor movement was very brief and it crumbled between 1905 and 1906 with the rejection by the majority of the Unionist legislators of most of the pro-labor legislation proposed by the labor representatives and with the vigorous opposition of the Unionist leadership to the big labor strikes led by the FLT against the sugar corporations during these years. From then on the Unionist leadership

maintained a consistently anti-labor, bourgeois position, often siding in this respect, curiously enough, with U.S. corporate interests and the colonial authorities, and this in spite of their otherwise autonomist, anti-colonial positions.

Meanwhile, the FLT participated in both the 1906 and 1908 election (as FLT and not as the Socialist Worker's Party) but it obtained only a very insignificant percentage of the vote; a result which together with its defeats in the 1905-1906 labor strikes and the continued persecutions by the employers, the colonial government and the Unionists, forced its leadership to abandon electoral politics for some years and to concentrate their efforts in increasing union membership (especially by recruiting the growing sugar cane proletariat) and in strengthening their organizational capacity for economic struggles. These efforts, in combination with the rapid growth of the rural proletariat and the continuous rise in the cost of living, would result during the 1910s in a significant increase in the membership of the FLT as well as in the increasing combativeness of the labor movement in their economic struggles, as reflected, for example, in the numerous, and often massive and successful strikes that were carried on during this decade against the mostly U.S. controlled sugar and tobacco corporations. Moreover, the increased strength

of the FLT and the labor movement led to the foundation of the Socialist Party in 1915, which over the years shared the same leadership of the FLT and a similar organizational and ideological evolution.

The political platforms of the Socialist Party expressed a consistently anti-capitalist position, condemining both foreign and local capitalist and monopolistic interests as well as the insular political forces--both the Unionists and Republicans--representing in one way or another those interests.[35] Yet, despite this, the party emphasized a number of immediate programatic goals which were seen not merely as compatible with the association of the Island with the U.S., but as realizable only under the "civilizing" and "progressive" influence of the U.S. and its liberal democratic institutions.[36] It is worth remembering in this context that along with the FLT, the party saw in this association and, indeed, in the extension of U.S. citizenship and the U.S. Constitution to the Puerto Rican, people as a further and firmer assurance of the civil democratic and labor rights of the insular working and poor masses. The programatic goals were reformist also in the sense that they did not presuppose the immediate radical transformation of the insular capitalist system along socialist lines. Nonetheless, these immediate reforms were profoundly democratic and redistributive: calling, accordingly, for

substantial political, socio-economic and cultural improvements for the working masses. Such were, for example, the demands for the definite and generalized establishment of the eight-hour work day, for significant improvement in the social conditions of laborers (in work, salaries, housing, health, credit, etc.), for the extension of public education to all children, for the establishment of progressive tax systems, for the enforcement of the "500-acre" law limiting to that amount of acreage the holdings of corporate landholdings (a law passed as an amendment of the Foraker Act and of which more will be said later), and the redistribution of these excess corporate lands to agricultural workers.[37] In addition, the Socialists called for stronger guarantees in the civil freedoms of press, association, speech and assembly, for the adoption of proportional representation in the insular legislature as well as of such participatory democratic methods as popular referenda and recalls, and, perhaps most interestingly, for universal suffrage for both men and women.[38] In fact, the Socialists were the first political party in the Island to favor women suffrage,[39] showing in this position, as well as in other respects that will be described later, a strong commitment to sex-gender equality and women liberation which was lacking in the major insular upper-class parties.

The new Socialist Party participated for the first time in electoral politics in the 1917 elections, where it obtained 14 percent of the total insular vote and won six municipalities. In the following elections in 1920 it almost duplicated this percentage (23.7 percent), a significant growth in popular support which was perceived notwithstanding its pro-American, albeit radical democratic and reformist orientation, as an ominous threat to the colonial and/or bourgeois order by the colonial authorities as well as by the majority leadership of both Unionist and Republican parties, so much of a threat that it triggered, with the support of Washington, the already described 1924-1929 alliance between these two previously antagonistic parties of the insular bourgeois and professional classes.[40] In the face of this alliance, and to lessen the impact of the imminent electoral victory of the Alianza, the leadership of the Socialist Party decided to join in a coalition with a dissident group of the Republican Party which had refused to join the Unionists in the Alianza. Apparently, this dissident group belonged to the more progressive sector of the Republican sector and was less identified with the large sugar interests.[41] Moreover, it appears that the Socialist leadership found this group--which included a number of lawyers and bureaucrats--as expedient not only in terms of their electoral and

parliamentary struggles but also in terms of any eventual participation in the control of government,[42] a target to which the Socialists increasingly directed their efforts.

Moreover, the coalition with the dissident Republicans, which was repeated in the 1928 elections, was facilitated by internal changes in the organization of the Socialist Party that were characterized by the increasing incorporation into its leadership of non-labor and more conservative members, who furthered the reformist and collaborationist forces in the party.[43] These internal changes, together with the influence of the experiences of the 1924 and 1928 coalitions prepared the way for the 1930s coalition of the Socialist Party with the then reunited Republican Party that would win the 1932 and 1936 elections and dominate accordingly during that decade the insular legislature and most of the cabinet positions in the colonial executive branch. Thus, by this time the Socialist Party as well as the FLT had gone a long way into becoming highly bureaucratized reformist organizations, monopolized by labor leaders well entrenched in their positions in the legislature or the colonial administration, compromising the radical demands of the rank and file, and firmly opposing the latter's strikes and confrontational mass actions; favoring instead a tactic of economic (through the insistance of collective negotiation and "industrial

peace") and political collaboration, by means of top-down bureaucratic and legislative machinations by which they expected to obtain some mild labor reforms.[44]

In spite of the conservative evolution of these labor organizations and their ideological contradictions, they still continued to be throughout all the period covered by this Chapter the most vigorous and consistent supporters and promoters of the civil democratic rights and participation of the popular classes in Puerto Rico, as well as of the significant betterment of the latter's socioeconomic condition. And, indeed, as an expression of such commitment to democracy and equality, they were the strongest advocates of the public education of the children of the urban and rural working classes, a commitment no doubt consistent with both the liberal democratic and socialist views that the popularization of schooling is not only essential for democratizing access to the products of human rationality, technology and science, but also an important --though not the only--means of democratizing and equalizing political and socio-economic life.

As stated previously, the Socialist Party maintained throughout the period covered here a strong commitment to sex-gender equality and women liberation. The same was true of the FLT. Aside from being the first political and economic organizations to advocate universal women

suffrage, they were also the first to actively incorporate women--albeit never to the same extent as men--in their leadership, the first to demand equal pay for equal work, while many of their leaders and rank and file (men as well as women) were the first on the Island to condemn male domination of women in domestic life as well as in work and public life.[45] It was in large measure the early incorporation of women in those organizations--most notably those organized by the FLT in the tobacco industry, where, as shall be seen in the following section, women came to constitute almost 53 percent of the labor force--that gave the movement, throughout the first three decades of this century, its militant feminist orientation.

In addition to the militant feminists of the labor movement, one must briefly consider here the professional and bourgeois feminist women who led the major suffragists organizations of the Island during the late 1910s and the 1920s, particularly the Liga Femenina Puertorriqueña (the Puerto Rican Feminine League) founded in 1917 and the Asociación Puertorriqueña de Mujeres Sufragistas (the Puerto Rican Association of Suffragettes) founded in 1925.[46] These professional and bourgeois feminists were in fact the most active suffragists of the period; however, the class background of these women was clearly reflected in the elitist character of their organizations and demands:

on the one hand, they failed to incorporate into their ranks the working class feminists, while on the other hand, their suffragist demands were generally limited to the extension of voting rights to women who could read and write.[47] It is relevant to say in this connection that the demand of suffrage for women who could read and write was commonly tied by these upper and middle class suffragists to the demands for equal educational opportunity for women and, particularly, to the demand for increased participation of women in higher education and in the professions. Indeed, as shall be seen in the next two sections of this Chapter, there was a substantial increase of participation of women in school education and in the professions--particularly in the teaching professions and, to a lesser extent, in such occupations as nursing and social work--during the first three decades of U.S. rule, an increase which provided the material human force behind the suffragist movement, whose vanguard was constituted in fact by female teachers.[48]

In any event, the suffragettes succeeded in 1929 in obtaining the vote for women who could read and write, a triumph which not surprisingly got the reluctant backing of both major anti-working class parties, the Unionist and Republicans, as well as the strong opposition of the Socialist Party, which as stated before, favored instead

universal suffrage for women, and hence a voting right that did not exclude the overwhelming majority of working women.[49] The latter, incidentally, was not achieved until 1936.

Unlike the case with women, there was no political movement or organization in Puerto Rico during the period covered by this Chapter which directly addressed the question of prejudice and discrimination against the non-white population--in fact no such movement or organization would emerge subsequently even up to the present time. Puerto Rico continued to be during the 1900-1930 period a highly racially mixed society, even though the census figures as indicated in Table 2 showed a decline in the non-white or "color" population--from 38.2 percent in 1899 to 25.7 percent in 1930--, following thus the trend initiated in the latter half of the 19th century. But again, it is very plausible that the U.S. census figures for the 1899-1930 period (the same may be said for those of the period afterward), like the Spanish ones for the latter half of the 19th century, greatly underestimated the proportion of the insular population of mixed racial origin, something which could say a lot not only of the probable confusion regarding "racial" criteria of the census takers, but also of the probable tendency of large sectors of the population to deny their racially mixed

origin, particularly the African component of such an origin.[50] And in fact, even though, as shall be seen below in this and the following sections of this Chapter, non-white people made substantial advances in literacy and schooling and had some degree of upward social mobility during this period, they continued to be discriminated on the basis of the color of the skin. While racial discrimination appears to have been most overtly practiced by the upper (overwhelmingly white) classes frequently obsessed with excluding colored people from their ranks--it seems all the same that racial prejudice permeated the whole society. Moreover, it appears that African or dark color traits were considered undesirable even by people of African descent.[51] An attitude which might explain the denial of such origin, especially by those of mixed racial background with lighter skin color, and consequently the underestimation of their number in the census figures.

Whatever this might be, it should be noted that even though the Republican Party had for a long time as its maximum leader a black man--the previously mentioned Barbosa--as well as the following of the bulk of the small non-white professional and middle class, and even though the Socialist Party had among its rank and file a large number of colored people, it appears that neither party nor

their most politically active non-white members made race prejudice and discrimination a specific political issue.[52] Interestingly, it appears that both the professional and working class sectors of the non-white population saw "Americanization" and the extension of U.S. political, labor and educational institutions as a significant improvement in their social and political rights, and indeed it seems that as members of either the Republican and Socialist parties, most blacks and mulattos were strong supporters of U.S. statehood for Puerto Rico.

Ironically, the annexationism of many of the non-white, Puerto Ricans collided with the racism of prominent North Americans in both the colonial government and in Washington. The high degree of racial mixture in the Island raised many doubts and hesitations in their minds, and for some it constituted one of the main reasons for opposing or delaying indefinitely the granting of statehood or self-government to the Islanders.[53] One example of this racist attitude was that of U.S. Speaker of the House "Uncle Joe" Cannon who on several occasions told this body that the Puerto Ricans were not "competent to exercise sovereign power" because, among other things, they were people of "mixed race", and about 30 percent were "pure African."[54] But it is worth remembering that though the racial mixture of the Puerto Ricans was an important element in the

prejudicial attitude of U.S. colonial and metropolitan officials, it was not the only element of their prejudice. Rather, they appear to have a more generalized ethnocentric attitude in which their feeling of white supremacy was closely intertwined with their sense of superiority as a North American Anglo-Saxon civilization and where Puerto Ricans were seen as inferior or backward, not merely because of their African component, but also because of their tropical and Hispanic heritage.[55] Moreover, the former's racism and ethnocentrism was characterized by a missionary, paternalistic attitude which though it saw Puerto Ricans as inferior and unfit for self-government, also saw them as capable in the long run of being "Americanized" and educated for self-government.[56] As has been shown before and as will be seen below, there was little in the "Americanization" and schooling processes sponsored by the U.S. colonial government in Puerto Rico that had to do with education for self-government, but whatever was accomplished in other respects, non-whites received as much attention as whites, at least in such crucial aspects as in the extension of political and labor rights and of primary education. Many colored people were employed in the public services, and a significant number became in fact public school teachers. A few, moreover, were appointed to upper level positions in the Department

of Education and in public administration and in fact one prominent black, Barbosa, was for many years, an appointed member of the Executive Council. More will be said in the following sections on the occupational and educational opportunities of the colored population. But for the moment it should be remembered that in spite of the already noted improvements in their political, occupational and educational situation not only did the overwhelming majority of them remain concentrated--like the overwhelming majority of whites--in the poor, working class sectors of the Island but also, as a whole, were still subjected to continued racial prejudice and discrimination by the white population and, particularly, by both the North Americans and the creole white elite, a situation which as suggested above was seldom made a public issue even by the small colored elite.[57]

Economic and Occupational Developments

In economic terms, the Foraker Act greatly dissapointed Puerto Rico's weak agro-export bourgeoisie. In particular, it was a great blow to their aspirations of having free access to the U.S. market, for though the Act included the Island within the U.S. tariff wall (the Dingley Tariff of 1897) it nevertheless left in effect the application of a

duty to all merchandise imported to the U.S. from Puerto Rico equivalent to 15 percent of the Dingley Tariff applied to foreign importers.[58] The enactment of this section of the Foraker Act responded in part to the pressures brought about by powerful sugar and tobacco lobbyists in the U.S. seeking to protect their interests from possible competition of Puerto Rican producers. However, the application of 15 percent of the Dingley tariff rates was justified mainly as a means of financing the insular government and in fact all revenues collected on account of this measure were for the use of the insular treasury. Interestingly enough, it is relevant to say that while such tariff duties represented a great burden to Puerto Rican consumers and agro-export hacendados, the revenues which they generated, helped to finance the projects of school construction and public works undertaken in the Island by U.S. colonial administrators at the turn of the century.[59] As it turned out, the Dingley Tariff was totally abolished for Puerto Rico in 1901, but custom duties were maintained in those Puerto Rican commodities (e.g. rum) exported to the U.S., whose counterparts in the mainland (e.g. whiskey) were also taxed; and again the revenues these duties generated continued to be returned to the insular treasury which in turn continued to assign them in large measure for the construction of school buildings and other public works.[60]

It should be observed that the total abolition of the Dingley Tariff for Puerto Rico was due to the fact that in 1901 a substitute tax revenue generating system was implemented on the Island. The new system, devised by the insular colonial administration and approved by the House of Delegates--then controlled by the local Republican Party--not only centralized the Island's revenue system, a feature which, as noted in the previous section, limited the tax collecting faculties of the municipalities, but in addition, it imposed a 1 percent tax on landed and chattel property, a feature which was strongly opposed by the local landed and propertied classes as well as by their political representatives in the Federalist Party.[61] Apparently these sectors were not only reacting to the further erosion of their political powers, evident for instance in the limiting of the prerogatives of the municipalities in tax collection, but also to what they perceived as a further aggravation of their already catastrophic economic situation. Having little capital or credit, many landowners were unable to pay the tax, and in fact, many had their properties confiscated by the government, or were practically forced to sell their lands, especially to the encroaching U.S. sugar corporations.

On the other hand, while the implementation of the 1901 tax-revenue system led to the total aboliton of the Dingley

Tariff and thus to the establishment of free trade between the Island and the U.S., it hardly benefitted Puerto Rican landowners, especially the coffee hacendados, industrialists and artisans, as well as local consumers. To be sure, the establishment of free trade benefitted to some extent, local sugar and tobacco exporters, given that their merchandise was protected in the U.S. market by high import tariffs on foreign goods. But this was not the case of the coffee exporter who remained unprotected in the mainland market from foreign competition, particularly from the "free" competition of the cheaper Brazilian coffee, while it continued to face high tariffs in its previously favored "European" markets.[63] The situation of the coffee producers was worsened not only by the new land tax and by credit limitations (credit flowed mainly now to sugar production in the coastal regions) but also by a drop in the world wide prices of coffee due to its large increased production in other areas, principally Brazil.[64]

Just before the First World War there was a brief recuperation of the economy of the coffee areas of the Island, a recuperation due mainly to the increased diversification of cash crops, which in some areas (particularly the Western highlands) meant the production along with coffee of such staples as bananas, plantains, oranges and wood, while in other regions (particularly the Eastern highlands)

the cultivation of coffee was replaced by tobacco, which found, unlike coffee, an accessible market in the U.S.[65] But the brief recuperation of those areas still producing coffee as the main staple (the Western highlands) received a major blow with the initiation of the First World War, which drastically cut the major market of the insular coffee producers--the European market--, a situation from which the large coffee producers, would not, if at all, easily recover.[66]

In the meantime, the mostly U.S. owned sugar and tobacco corporations (in the latter case, U.S. corporations owned mainly the tobacco processing plants and not necessarily the tobacco farms; in the sugar industry, however, they had substantial direct control of both the farms and the large-scale sugar mills or "centrales") benefitted greatly not only from the free access of their commodities to the protected U.S. market but also from the increasingly weakened political and economic situation of the local hacendados and farmers with medium and small size holdings.[67] Continuing the trend initiated during the military regime, many of these landowners, especially those in the coastal areas, would lose or sell their lands to the large, primarily to the absentee sugar corporations--with their large-scale, centralized sugar mills "centrales"; although

a few would be able to become themselves large-scale, sugar plantation owners.[68] Others would become small and medium size farmers--the so-called "colonos"--cultivating sugar cane to be processed in the large-scale mills of the absentee, mostly U.S. sugar corporations; while still others, especially those in the Eastern highlands of Puerto Rico, would become small-scale producers of tobacco to be processed by the factories of the large U.S. tobacco companies.[69]

These changes would be characterized not only by a radical shift from coffee to sugar production as the principal economic activity and export of the Island but also by a dramatic increase in the concentration of land in the hands of a few absentee sugar companies. Moreover, they would also be characterized by new patterns of labor migration and labor control. The shift in economic importance from coffee to sugar was already evident early in the 20th century as indicated for example by the trade statistics of 1901 which show that in that year sugar already accounted for 55.0 percent of the total value of exports of the Island, while coffee made up only 19.6 percent of the value of exports, reflecting thus a sharp contrast with the corresponding figures of just four years before (1897) which were respectively 21.6 and 63.8 percent.[70] During

the rest of the period covered by this Chapter (1899-1930) sugar production would retain its economic hegemony, oscillating (mainly on account of changing world market prices) between 45 and 65 percent of the total value of exports; while coffee, though recuperating to some degree in 1910 and booming somewhat in years of soaring world market prices (e.g. 1920), would on the whole continue to stagnate and decline as an export crop, dropping to 6 percent in 1920 and to less than 1 percent by 1929 of the total value of exports.[71] Table 4 shows the enormous expansion in land cultivated by sugar cane landholders and the parallel stagnation of land use by coffee producers during the 1899-1929 period. Table 5 shows, moreover, the dramatic process of land production which accompanied the inmense growth of sugar production. Interestingly, this concentration of land occured despite the previously mentioned amendment (in 1900) to the Foraker Act which prohibited any individual corporation from owning or controlling over 500 acres of land. In spite of its formal intentions, the so-called "500 Acre Law" included no provision or penalties for enforcement and it would remain a dead letter for the next 4 decades.[72] This can be seen most forcefully in the holdings of the large U.S. sugar corporations operating in the Island. In 1929, for instance, they controlled 170,675 acres of land--of which

TABLE 4

Area in Cultivation of Major Export Products, 1899-1929

(In Thousand of Cuerdas)*

	1899	1909	1919	1929
Total Land Cultivated	478.0	534.5	660.4	787.0
Sugar Cane	72.1	145.4	237.8	245.2
Coffee	197.0	186.9	193.6	191.7
Tobacco	6.0	22.1	39.1	52.9

* 1 cuerda = 0.9712 acres

Sources: U.S. War Department (1900a)
Descartes (1946:25)

TABLE 5

Land Area Controlled by Size of Farms, 1899-1929

(In Percentages)

CUERDAS	1899	1909	1919	1929
Less than 20	33.0	12.4	10.6	14.1
20- 49	17.5	12.9	12.6	13.4
50- 99	13.6	12.0	11.6	11.4
100-174	35.5*	10.6	10.4	10.2
175-499		20.3	19.3	17.1
500-999		10.5	10.0	8.5
1000+		21.3	25.5	25.2

* Includes all farms over 100 cuerdas

Source: Bergad (1978:77)

they owned 94,488 and leased or contracted 76,187--that is, 68 percent of all the sugar cane cultivated land (which amounted to around 251,000 acres) in the Island.[73] Throughout the first three decades of this century, these corporations would make substantial profits paying dividends to their stockholders ranging from 4 to 115 percent of their investment.[74] Profits made possible in part by the miserable wages payed to workers in the mills and sugar fields of which more will be said below. It should also be mentioned in this context that the large profits of the sugar industry were also due to some degree to the relatively small taxes they payed the insular and municipal treasuries, for though as a whole their taxes accounted for nearly one-fourth of all the revenues received by those treasuries, given the enormous size of the industry, all the same they managed to pay very little relative to the value of their property holdings, and consistently resisted any attempt of the insular government to impose stiffer taxes on the sugar corporations.[75]

It should be mentioned in this connection that though the tobacco industry also expanded considerably during the 1899-1929 period (as shown, for example, in Table 4), and though such expansion was also due to a great extent to the free access of its crop to the protected U.S. market and to the large investments of U.S. capital, tobacco

cultivation did not experience the process of land concentration which characterized the expansion of sugar cane cultivation under absentee corporations. The big U.S. tobacco corporations established in the Island would seldom attempt to gain direct control of the land, limiting themselves rather to the monopolization of the marketing and processing operations, and leaving the actual cultivation of tobacco to small-scale farmers.[76] Thus, the expansion of the tobacco industry would be characterized by the emergence of a large group of small farm owners subordinated nevertheless to the large U.S. tobacco corporations, who through the monopolization of manufacturing and marketing, also controlled the credit and crop purchases of the tobacco growers.[77]

The situation of these small-scale tobacco growers was in a sense similar to that of the already mentioned "colonos", that is, the sugar planters with small and medium holdings, who either as cash tenants, share croppers or property owners grew sugar cane but had to sell their crop to the large corporation-owned sugar mills ("centrales").[78] With the expansion of sugar production, the colonos became a large and important socio-economic group as can be seen indirectly from 1930 estimates which show that one-fourth of all cultivated sugar cane land in the Island was farmed by the dependent colonos (while one-

half was owned by plantation corporations and the remainder was leased by the companies). But in such a capacity, they were, as were the small-scale tobacco growers with respect to the tobacco corporations, a subordinate sector, dependent on the sugar corporation-owned centrales for credit and crop purchases.[79] Moreover, it would be a frequent and apparently justified complaint of the "colonos" that the centrales cheated them on the value of their sugar cane.[80]

While the sugar colonos and the small tobacco growers emerged during the 1899-1930 period as important subordinate socio-economic groups to the large, and mostly absentee, sugar and tobacco corporations, these corporations benefitted most particularly from the growth during that same period of an abundant supply of landless and propertyless wage-laborers generated in great measure by the extension and land concentration of the sugar corporations and by the parallel crisis in the coffee producing regions.[81] To a great extent it was the constitution of this large reserve army of surplus labor what made possible the substantial profits of the sugar corporations, given their power in such circumstances to pay very miserable wages to their workers. More will be said on this point shortly.

With the expansion of sugar plantations, many small

landholders and tenant peasants "agregados" in the coastal regions were forced to sell their lands or to leave their subsistence plots in the haciendas, while with the stagnation and decline of the coffee producing areas many tenant peasants and wage-laborers in the haciendas, along with some small farmers who had supplemented their income as occasional laborers in the coffee haciendas, would migrate to the coastal sugar regions and urban centers with large tobacco factories and/or with expanding commercial export-import activities and governmental bureaucracies. These processes of internal migration were already clearly evident during the first decade of U.S. rule as reflected for example in the census data for the 1899-1900 period which shows that while the general population of the Island increased 17.3 percent during that period, the population in the 17 municipalities with the major concentration of sugar-cane cultivation rose 45.4 percent (the Island was then divided into 70 municipalities) and, on the other hand, the population in the major coffee growing municipalities declined 4.2 percent.[82] Moreover, of the 7 municipalities which had a population increase of over 50 percent, 5 were sugar-producing municipalities while the other 2 had large-scale tobacco processing factories in their urban centers which were where the increase in population mostly took place.[83] It should be noted here in passing, that the same

processes which generated these internal massive labor migrations, would trigger since the 1900s, the emigration of Puerto Rican laborers to the U.S. and others of its dependencies, a form of migration which would intensify in the 1920s and which would be favored, if not actively sponsored, by colonial officials.[84]

In addition to the above mentioned processes of proletarization and surplus labor generation, the 2 most important and dynamic industries of the agro-export sector went through a process of technical innovation--e.g. increase mechanization and use of fertilizers in the sugar fields and increase of mechanization in both the sugar mills and the tobacco factories, especially during the 1920s--which greatly reduced the labor needs of these industries and limited the growth of their employment capacity.[85] The slowdown in the growth of employment of these industries, after their initial (1899-1910) rapid increase, can be seen in Table 6 with respect to the agricultural phase of the sugar industry during the 1910-1920 period as well as with respect to the manufacturing aspects of both sugar and tobacco between 1910-1920.[86] Though, as shall be seen later (but can be seen also from Table 6), between 1899 and 1930 there was a rapid growth in employment in other sectors of the economy, like, for

TABLE 6

Employment by Economic Sector for Puerto Rico, 1899-1930

SECTOR	1899 NUMBER	1899 %	1910 NUMBER	1910 %	1920 NUMBER	1920 %	1930 NUMBER	1930 %
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing	198,761	62.8	240,845	61.3	245,284	60.2	263,577	52.4
Sugar Cane	N.A.		84,153		84,827		N.A.	
Tobacco	N.A.		6,781		30,489		N.A.	
Coffee	N.A.		37,960		47,925		N.A.	
Mining	N.A.		116	.03	202	.05	364	.07
Construction	N.A.		7,797	2.0	9,317	2.3	12,766	2.5
Manufacturing	26,515	8.4	45,278	11.5	62,199	15.3	98,750	19.6
Sugar-Mills	N.A.		6,155		8,723		11,446	
Tobacco	3,743		11,315		16,811		15,508	
Home Needlework	N.A.		11,200		14,382		42,122	
Other Textiles	N.A.		2,000		3,693		13,197	
Transportation & Communication	24,076	7.6	9,080	2.3	10,063	2.5	17,137	3.4
Commerce, Finance, Trade			25,579	6.5	25,585	6.3	40,346	8.0
Services	67,013	21.2	57,128	14.5	42,823	10.5	55,736	11.1
Domestic	N.A.		51,391		35,643		38,408	
Professional	N.A.		1,365		3,415		6,894	
Other	N.A.		4,372		3,765		10,436	
Government, not classified elsewhere	N.A.		4,069	1.0	6,395	1.6	11,423	2.3
Other			3,126	.8	5,486	1.3	3,260	0.6
Total Employment	316,356	100.0	393,027	100.0	407,324	100.0	502,759	100.0

Sources: U.S. War Department (1900a)
Perloff (1950:41)

instance, in needlework manufacturing and in the commercial, service (non-domestic) and governmental sectors, these were not substantial enough to reduce in any significant degree the level of surplus labor generated in the other areas of the economy. Moreover, the situation was complicated by the rapid growth of the general population of the Island which increased 61.9 percent between 1899 and 1930 (see Table 1) partly on account of the lower death rates which resulted from the improvements in public health made by the colonial regime during the same period. The convergence of the process of rapid population growth and the surplus labor generating processes described above is reflected in the high level of unemployment which, according to a 1931 socio-economic study of the Island, rose from 17 percent in 1899 to 30 percent in 1930.[87] It should be remembered that this situation of rapid population growth and high unemployment as well as general low wages was taking place while the sugar and tobacco industry (the latter at least until the early 1920s) were experiencing impressive rates of growth in production and generating sustained profits for their absentee corporate owners. Interestingly, there would be frequent complaints raised by colonial officials at least since 1905 regarding the so-called "over population" of the Island as the main source of most of the problems of its working classes, complaints which were accompanied

usually by recommednations and sometimes by plans for the emigration of Puerto Rican laborers, either to the U.S. or to others of its dependencies, as a remedy for its over population problem.[88]

Already by 1910 the sugar industry in its agricultural phase employed a larger labor force than the coffee industry and throughout the rest of the period covered by this Chapter it would employ the majority of all agricultural workers or for that matter the largest number of workers in any of the sectors of the insular economy (see Table 6). Moreover, the growth of employment in the sugar plantations marked the mass emergence of a modern form of subordinated and low-skilled agricultural worker who differed dramatically from that associated with the coffee haciendas or traditional small landholders. The following description from a recent survey of Puerto Rico's agrarian history summarizes well the main characteristics of the new form of subordinated labor represented by the sugar cane worker:

> Resident workers lived clustered together in villages (some of which were in fact created by the sugar companies themselves) rather than dispersed throughout the countryside. The personal relations between patron and client that typified the hacienda were replaced by the new corporate order of employer and employee. The agricultural day laborer, who in the highlands usually maintained a subsistence plot, now as converted into a proletarian with few

> alternatives for survival other than sale of his labor power. Money became the only mechanism for the satisfaction of all needs. Levels of consumption became the new measure of status, success, or failure. At the same time, the nature of work shifted from the individualism of the dispersed rural farmer to the collectivism of a modern proletariat. Work schedules became regimented and labor habits were regulated and standardized.[89]

These conditions of collective association and homogenization and of depersonalized economic subordination to corporate employers apparently facilitated the emergence among many sugar cane workers of a sense of class membership and class combativeness which found organized expression (as well as additional formative influence) first in the FLT and later the Socialist Party whose political trajectories were described in the previous section.[90] Here it is only necessary to add that despite the forcefulness of such labor organizations and their growing popularity among the sugar plantation proletariat, their power relative to that of the sugar corporations was severely limited by the existence of the previously mentioned large reserve army of surplus agricultural wage workers which maintained an intense competition among laborers for the available work and, hence a downward pressure on their wages.[91] Thus, although wages in the sugar plantations rose and were higher than in other agricultural sectors--a gain which could in part be attributed to the struggles of the FLT--and although with the leadership and

support of both the FLT and the Socialist Party, the sugar proletariat (as well as large sector of the growing urban proletariat) achieved important labor rights and protective legislation, their wages were considerably lower than those of other tropical, cane producing countries (e.g. Cuba, Hawaii, Honduras and The Bahamas), and their overall working and living conditions remained extremely poor.[92] Two additional problems which aggravated their situation were, on the one hand, the seasonal character of their employment in the sugar plantations (shortened to 5 or 6 months by the large scale, technically advanced grinding centrales) left them, as landless, propertyless wage workers, unemployed or underemployed the remainder of the year or forced them to migrate to other areas to earn a living; and second, by the persistent high prices of foodstuffs and other consumer goods in the Island which accompanied the incorporation of Puerto Rico as a protected free market for relatively expensive U.S. goods and the growing dependence of the Island on imported U.S. foodstuff as it specialized in the monocultural export crops of sugar and tobacco.[93]

Another effect of the incorporation of Puerto Rico within the U.S. tariffs walls was that it opened the Island to the large-scale penetration of manufactured products

with which most local bourgeois or artisany manufacturer could not compete.[94] But though this stifled the development of local manufacturers, it favored the expansion of export oriented manufacturing industries controlled by U.S. capital, most notably the two associated to sugar and tobacco production as well as the one associated to the U.S. garment industry.

In the sugar industry the large-scale and capital intensive sugar mills (the "centrales") provided during this period one of the major sources of manufacturing employment --third in importance in this respect after tobacco and needlework industries (See Table 6). Wages in the sugar centrales were low but they were higher than those in the sugar fields as well as those in the low capitalized tobacco and home needlework industries. On the other hand, though compared to the sugar fields, sugar mills employed more skilled workers, the number of such workers was still relatively small while that of unskilled workers continued to prevail.[95] Moreover, like work in the sugar fields, that in the sugar mills was mostly seasonal and subjected to the highly impersonal and industrially rationalized managerial hierarchy which characterized the whole sugar corporate structure.[96]

More important than the sugar mills as sources of

employment in manufacturing during the 1900-1930 period, were the tobacco and needlework industries (See Table 6). Though these industries also owed their expansion to the large inflow of U.S. capital and to the protected U.S. market, they were considerably less technically capitalized and more labor intensive than the sugar "centrales" and payed lower wages than the latter. Moreover, as will be seen shortly, the growth of both industries provided for the large incorporation of women into the manufacturing sectors of the economy at considerable low wages and conditions of work.

Employment in tobacco manufacturing, primarily in cigar making, increased considerably during the first two decades of U.S. colonial rule, growing from 3,743 in 1899, to 11,315 in 1910 and 16,811 in 1920 (See Table 6); but in the 1920s it began to decline as cigar exports to the United States decreased--due both to competition from foreign tobacco producers and to changes in consumption patterns in the U.S. from cigar to cigarette smoking--and as tobacco manufacturing production was mechanized.[97] Its phase of great expansion, however, was characterized by the rapid establishment of a complex of large scale, labor intensive factories--most, as previously noted, under the control of one U.S. corporation--and conversely by the displacement of many local small-scale tobacco manufacturers

and artisans. Already by 1910, 74.6 percent of all the laborers in tobacco manufacturing were employed in factories of more than 100 workers while in the rest of the manufacturing industries, with the exception of the sugar centrales, factories of such magnitude represented only 8.1 percent of the employed.[98] Apparently, many of the displaced small tobacco manufacturers and artisans as well as many other artisan producers who could not compete with the influx of U.S. manufactured products, became an important segment of the wage-labor force of the corporate tobacco factories.[99] In effect, artisans in other trades were also going through a process of proletarization though perhaps not as intense as in the tobacco industry.[100]

One of the most interesting developments of this industry was the growing and large participation of women therein, a development which contrasted with the situation in the sugar industry where women had practically no participation as wage workers. Thus, for example, while women contributed 1.6 percent of the total labor force of the tobacco industry in 1899, in 1910 their participation rose to 27.8 percent and by 1930 it was 59.9 percent.[101] Such increased participation was organized, however, in a patriarchal division of labor in which women mostly performed the tasks of tobacco stripping and classification, which were the lowest paid in the industry, while the

higher payed tasks of cigar making itself were done by men.[102]

Another important development in the tobacoo manufacturing industry was, as noted in the previous section, the emergence in it of a combative labor force--both male and female--which during the first two decades of the century acted as the vanguard of the labor movement and provided many of the leaders of the FLT and the Socialist Party, a development triggered in part by the conditions of labor concentration and impersonal wage-labor exploitation which characterized the large-scale and hierarchical corporate structure of the tobacco factories.[103] Their combativeness is reflected in the number of strikes--10 out of a total of 33 important labor strikes in the Island--which they directed against the tobacco corporations during the first 12 years of U.S. colonial rule.[104]

In the garment (home needlework and other textile products) industries, employment rose greatly during the 1900-1930 period, and especially sharply during the 1920s, and by 1930 the level of employment in just home needlework surpassed by far those of both the tobacco and sugar manufacturing industries, constituting 42.9 percent of the whole manufacturing sector (See Table 6). In fact, between 1910 and 1930, when the population of the Island rose 38.1

percent, employment in the home needlework industry increased 276.1 percent while that of the rest of the manufacturing sector rose 64.4 percent (See Table 1 and 6).

The employment structure of the garment industries during this period reveals even more dramatically than that of the tobacco factories, the patriarchal character of the insular labor market and division of labor. Women, for example, constituted in 1930, 99.7 percent[105] of the labor force of the home needlework industry, an industry which payed among the lowest wages in the whole Island and required the largest hours of work.[106] Moreover, since it was home labor, it was more sex-segregated than employment in the tobacco industry where women worked along with men--albeit in lower payed and lower skilled tasks. In this sex-segregated, home related aspect, needlework resembled work in the domestic occupations. Interestingly, by 1930, the female employment level in home needlework had almost reached the level of female employment in the servant and launderer categories of the domestic service sector which had been until then the major--though declining--source of women employment in the Island (See Table 7). In this connection, it should be noted that as shown in Table 7 the participation of women in these home-related, low paying occupations amounted to nearly 55 percent of all employed women (those in the clothing factories accounted

TABLE 7

Major Female Occupations and Percentages

of Total Female Employment, 1899-1930

	1899		1910		1920		1930	
	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%
Servants	18,453	38.7	18,781	24.4	15,382	17.8	20,300	16.1
Laundresses	16,855	35.3	25,884	33.7	16,317	18.9	14,952	11.9
Home Needlework	5,785	12.1	11,200	14.6	12,650	14.6	34,345	27.3
Clothing Factories	N.A.		N.A.		3,568	4.1	6,383	5.1
Tobacco Factories	60	0.1	3,204	4.2	8,573	9.9	9,290	7.4
Straw Hatmaking	387	0.8	2,862	3.7	3,633	4.2	691	0.5
Clerical	N.A.		189	0.2	937	1.1	2,500	2.0
Saleswomen & Retail	N.A.		631	0.8	818	0.9	1,581	1.3
Teachers	563	1.2	1,172	1.5	2,636	3.0	4,256	3.4
Nurses	64	0.1	189	0.2	362	0.4	921	0.7
Public Service not elsewhere classified	N.A.		47	0.1	63	0.1	49	-
Total Employed	47,701	100.0	76,892	100.0	86,462	100.0	125,777	100.0

Sources: U.S. War Department (1900a)
U.S. Bureau of the Census (1910-1930)

for an additional 5.1 percent, and those in the tobacco industries for 7.4 percent) in 1930.

As mentioned above, the needlework and garment industry in general, like the sugar and tobacco industries, owed much of its growth to the inflow of U.S. capital and to the large protected U.S. market. However, considering that the former, unlike the latter, relied heavily on the importation of raw and other primary processing materials (e.g. fabrics), there appear to have been additional, special reasons for the interest of U.S. garment companies in developing the industry in Puerto Rico. In this connection, the explanation offered by the important 1930 report of the Brookings Institute is particularly revealing. As stated by the report,

> ...Puerto Rico (sic) has had considerable manufacturing development by the American immigration laws which have caused certain industries which formerly relied upon imported cheap labor from Europe and Asia to pay increasing attention to the cheap labor market afforded by Puerto Rico (sic). The most notable expansion has been in the market garment trades.[107]

Of course, as has been shown above, the cheap labor that made possible this expansion was mostly female and as such, the lowest paid in the Island.

As suggested before, the employment levels of the construction, communication, trade, service (non-domestic) and clerical sectors of the economy rose rapidly during the

1899-1930 period. Between 1910 and 1930, for example, while the general population of the Island rose 38.1 percent, the employment in those sectors increased as follows: 63.7 percent in construction; 114.8 percent in transportation and communication; 48.6 percent in trade; 168.7 percent in professional and related services; and 280.9 percent in the clerical occupations (See Tables 6 and 8). In many ways, the expansion of these sectors was associated with or responded to the growth of the agro-export agricultural and manufacturing areas, particularly to the sugar industry, for which they provided supporting and complementary services. This can be seen in the expansion between 1910 and 1930 of those clerical and professional categories which were directly involved in the administrative, technical and legal aspects of the agro-export economy. Thus, for example, the great increases of the following occupational categories: stenographers and typists, 926.2 percent; accountants, bookkeepers and cashiers, 173.9 percent; chemists, assayers and metal-lurgists, 457.1 percent; engineers, 313.8 percent; and lawyers, 88.4 percent (See Table 8).

Some of these occupations also owed their growth during this period to the considerable expansion of the government apparatus, an expansion that cannot be fully appreciated from the census employment data summarized in

TABLE 8

Changes in Selected Professional and Clerical Occupations and Percentages of Women in Each Category, 1899-1930

	1899		1910		1920		1930		% CHANGES FOR TOTAL IN EACH CATEGORY
	NUMBER	% WOMEN	NUMBER	% WOMEN	NUMBER	% WOMEN	NUMBER	% WOMEN	
									1899-1930
Total Professional & related services	2,194	14.2	4,275	35.0	6,941	46.9	11,486	49.3	423.5
Dentists	42	0	57	0	118	0.9	143	4.9	240.5
Engineers	115	0	145	0	265	0	600	0	421.7
Lawyers, Judges	206	0	294	0	390	0.5	554	1.3	168.9
Nurses, Dietitians & Therapists	127	50.4	107	96.3	393	92.1	976	94.4	668.5
Physicians & Surgeons	219	0	203	0	443	3.2	427	3.0	95.0
Teachers	809	30.4	2,239	52.3	3,742	70.5	5,710	74.5	605.8
									1900-1930
Chemists, Assayens, & Metallurgists	N.A.		63	0	154	0	351	0.9	457.1
Total Clerical	N.A.		2,624	7.2	5,270	17.8	9,995	25.0	280.9
Accountants, Bookkeepers Cashiers	N.A.		641	6.6	1,023	14.0	1,756	15.2	173.9
Stenographers & Typists	N.A.		225	50.2	839	60.3	2,309	66.4	926.2

Sources: U.S. War Department (1900a)
U.S. Bureau of the Census (1910-1930)

Table 6, since many government employees were classified there under such other general categories as construction, transportation, clerical and professional and non-domestic services. This is more evident perhaps, in the specific categories of teachers and nurses, which owed most of their considerable increase during this period--from 1899 to 1930 they grew 605.8 percent and 668.5 percent respectively (See Table 8)--to the large expansion of the public educational and health system. (While the U.S. Census reports a total of 5,710 of public and private teachers in Puerto Rico in 1930, of these at least 4,451 were employed in public schools.)[108]

But apart from its expansion as a source of employment, the growth of the government sector can be seen also from insular income data which shows that by 1929 this sector was second only to agriculture in the generation of the whole insular income (generating 14.2 percent compared to the 49.4 percent generated by agriculture and the 9.0 percent by manufacturing).[109] In general, the overall growth of the government apparatus was made possible by the relatively efficient tax system established by U.S. colonial officials since early in the century, a system which managed to derive an ever larger amount of revenues from the increasingly more prosperous middle and high income groups of the Island,[110] especially from those linked to

the expanding agro-export economy; though it should be kept in mind, as noted before, that the largest, mostly absentee, corporations and landowners persistently refused and/or avoided paying such taxes.[111] Less important during this period as a source for financing the expansion of the government apparatus, but also contributing in some degree, were the operating expenses of the federal civil and military agencies on the Island, as well as the receipts of the insular treasury from the already mentioned U.S. custom duties on goods entering the Island from foreign countries and from federal excise taxes on such items as cigars, cigarettes and alcohol produced in the Island and shipped to the U.S.[112]

To a great extent, the enlargement of the government apparatus during this period reflected the active and fundamental role that the government had in the development of the agro-export economy, particularly in the rapid growth of the sugar industry. As Perloff puts it, the government provided "essential development capital in the form of a wide variety of public works."[113] Thus, in a sense, the large-scale expenditures and involvement of the government during this period, in the construction and/or operation of roads, communication facilities, power plants, irrigation systems and public health and educational systems could be seen as "helping to lay the foundation for economic

expansion,"[114] an expansion which as has been shown previously, was basically characterized by a dependent agro-export orientation under the control of U.S. corporate capital. But apart from their interest in facilitating such economic development, colonial officials were also interested in securing the political and cultural hegemony of the U.S. over Puerto Rico, an interest which was embodied in the already noted extension, centralization and "Americanization" of the administrative, legal and educational spheres of the colonial government.

However, it is important to have in mind that the growth of the governmental apparatus did not respond only to the hegemonic political and economic pressures of U.S. colonial officials and U.S. corporate interests but to a certain extent also to the varying pressures of insular social forces originating in both the elite and popular sectors of the population. Most segments of the local population benefitted in some degree or another from the expansion of government dependencies such as, for example, the public health and educational systems. The extension of the public school system in particular enjoyed widespread support, a support which it owed in part to the popular belief that public education was a fundamental, if not the most important, institution in the formation of the informed and knowledgeable citizen required by a liberal, democratic,

meritocratic and prosperous society. But perhaps more important than this was the growing popular identification of schooling as the principal mean of gaining access to upward mobility, power and wealth in a society which aside its growing bureaucratic structure and its liberal democratic dreams, provided even to its local elites limited access to the major sources of political and economic power, as these were monopolized by the U.S. colonial officials and by U.S. corporate capital.

Despite the general and widespread support for public education during the 1899-1930 period, there were significant class differences in the demands for its extension. Thus, for the working classes, the priority continued to be the expansion of primary education for even though there had been during this period an impressive increase of public primary schools, by 1930, as shall be seen later, a large portion of the working class population remained illiterate as well as a substantial part of their school-age children, principally those in the rural areas, who did not yet had access to schools. Working class demands for basic public education intensified with their increasing proletarization and urbanization and with their growing involvement in organized labor and electoral politics. Another constant demand of the working classes during this period, as indicated before, was for the establishment of

vocational and industrial schools,[115] a demand which reflects partly the influence, as noted in the previous section, of the American Federation of Labor on the insular labor movement, but perhaps too, the attempts of the local working class to secure technical training in a publicly controlled and funded institution rather than being dependent on capitalist employers who had not only increasingly separated them from the means of production, but also, as in the case of the formerly independent artisans, displaced them from direct control over the informal apprenticeship experience and on the job training processes. On the other hand, it seems plausible also that for many workers it was becoming increasingly evident that the improvement of their living standards and working conditions depended less on their collective organized struggles than on their individual ability to compete for higher paying and better jobs in the expanding intermediary white collar positions of clerical and analogous occupations, positions which formally required increasingly higher levels of schooling. This possible growing identification of schooling as a gateway to upward mobility must be seen in the light of the inability of the working class organizations--the FLT and the Socialist Party--to counteract, despite their continuous efforts, the effects of the persistently large reserve army of the unemployed which as

already noted, exerted a continuing depressing pressure on the wages and working conditions of most manual, skilled and unskilled workers. In any case, it appears that though most of the working class children who had access to public education had only 2 or 3 years of schooling,[116] a few--mostly in the urban areas--reached the higher primary and secondary grades, from which they were in a better position to have access to the expanding--though still very limited--intermediary white collar positions.

The local bourgeois, petty bourgeois and professional sectors, on the other hand, while generally in favor of the expansion of public primary schooling and the establishment of vocational schools were primarily concerned with the extension of educational opportunities at the secondary (namely college preparatory) and university level. For these sectors, the enlargement of such forms of schooling was seen as ensuring their children access to the professional and managerial occupations which were gaining increasing importance as a major source of prestige, wealth and even power in the colonial society, especially as these occupations increased with the rise of urbanization and the expansion of the agro-export economy and governmental apparatus. Indeed, the major employer of professionals in Puerto Rico was the public educational system itself, whose growing army of teachers constituted by far

the largest group of professionals in the Island (See Table 8). The increasing importance of the professional/managerial positions as a source of prestige, wealth, and power, and hence the growing demand for university credentials which they required, must be seen in light of the continuing difficulties of the local elite in gaining or retaining control over the traditional sources of power and wealth in the Island--such as land, capital or political authority--within the U.S. controlled colonial and capitalist structure. Apparently, the demand for university education was particularly strong among former hacendados and medium-sized landowners who with the decline of the coffee economy and the expansion of the sugar corporations, sold their lands or became absentee renters, reinvesting their wealth to a great extent in the professional/managerial education of their children to compensate for their own declining power and wealth.[117]

As shall be seen in more detail in the next section, the result of these various class pressures, in conjunction to the hegemonic pressures of the colonial government, was the development of highly centralized, class differentiated and hierarchized, but generally expanding public school system which while ensuring the mostly urban bourgeois, professional and commercial petty bourgeois classes enlarged opportunities for secondary and university

education gave at the same time to the working classes--particularly, their urban sectors--increased access to the primary levels of the school system, and even to a few of these, better opportunities of access to the secondary levels.

As shall also be seen in the following section, such development was to a large degree patriarchal in character. Nevertheless, the access of women to the different levels (primary, secondary and university) of the co-educational school system matched that of men, while their incorporation into the mostly school-based white collar occupations increased at a rapid pace, specifically in the clerical positions, where their participation relative to men rose from 7.2 percent to 25.0 percent between 1910 and 1930, and most dramatically in the professional occupations, where their participation during the same period rose from 35.0 percent to 49.3 percent (See Table 8). Notwithstanding this, it is worth remembering that such large-scale incorporation into the white-collar occupations, like their large-scale inclusion into the manual and service occupations mentioned before, was characterized by its patriarchal, sex/gender differentiated structure, for the specific occupations into which women were largely incorporated, were the lowest paying and less prestigious

positions in each occupational category. Such was the case in 1930, for instance, with teachers and nurses who accounted for 75.1 and 16.3 percents respectively of all females in the general professional service category and with stenographers and typists which accounted for 61.3 percent of all women in the clerical occupations.[118] Yet despite the patriarchal inclusion of women into the professional, white collar and blue collar occupations, it is worth remembering that such development was, however, limited, a notable improvement in their social status, and independently of the probable effects which it might have had in increasing their power vis-a-vis men within the family sphere--unfortunately, one can only speculate here on the plausibility of this statement given the absence of studies in this regard--it facilitated their increased participation in public life, as their already noted active involvement in the suffragist movement, the FLT, and Socialist Party demostrates.

With respect to colored people, it should be observed that by 1935 their occupational distribution came to parallel that of the white population, though relative to the latter they were underrepresented in the professional and clerical categories and overrepresented in the domestic services (See Table 9). The overwhelming majority of them,

TABLE 9

Occupational Distribution by Color, 1935

	TOTAL		WHITES		NONWHITES	
	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%	NUMBER	%
Agriculture	246,386	47.1	192,935	48.5	53,451	42.7
Forestry and Fishing	2,463	0.5	1,793	0.5	670	0.5
Mining	543	0.1	346	0.1	197	0.2
Manufacturing	132,315	25.3	95,943	24.1	36,372	29.1
Transportation and Communication	20,686	4.0	14,103	3.5	6,583	5.3
Trade	38,323	7.3	32,457	8.2	5,866	4.7
Public Service	5,937	1.1	4,854	1.2	1,083	0.9
Professional Service	15,346	2.9	12,970	3.3	2,376	1.9
Domestic and Personal Services	42,810	8.2	26,699	6.7	16,111	12.9
Clerical Occupations	18,016	3.4	15,626	3.9	2,390	1.9
All Occupations	522,825	100.0	397,726	100.0	125,099	100.0

Source: U.S. Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration (1938)

like that of whites, were farm laborers or, to a lesser extent, blue collar workers in the sugar industry. As most whites, then, they were persistently subjected to extremely low wages and the increasing threat of unemployment. On the other hand, they had also been to some degree the beneficiaries of the political and labor rights and school attainments achieved by the working classes under U.S. rule, for which, as has been seen before, the FLT and the Socialist Party had forcefully articulated and pressed for. Moreover, the improved primary school attainments of colored people--of which more will be said in the following section--facilitated the entrance of a minority of them into the secondary and post-secondary institutions, increasing their access to the professional occupations, particularly to the teaching professions. Thus, for example, between 1902 and 1925 the number of colored teachers in the public school system increased in absolute terms from 73 to 826, while in proportion to the total number of public school teachers it increased from 7.8 percent to 16.7 percent (this, it should be kept in mind, at a time when the percentage of the total colored population of the Island decreased between 1899 to 1930 from 38.2 to 25.7 percent).[119] However, whatever their advances in schooling and the professions, it is worth repeating in this context--as was noted in the preceeding section--that

by 1930 colored people were still significantly discriminated against by the white creole elite and by North Americans in many spheres of social activity, and continued to be excluded from the most prominent professions (medicine, law, engineering, etc.) and from high positions in the public services and in business.[120]

To end this section, and returning briefly to the topic on the expansions of the insular governmental apparatus, it should be considered that another important factor which contributed to its growth as an employment sector was the practice of political patronage which as noted previously characterized party politics in Puerto Rico. For both the Republican and Unionists parties--as well as for the Socialist Party during the 1930s--the capacity to provide political patronage in the form of government employment became an increasingly important means of marshalling electoral support, particularly as the reserve army of the unemployed rose to massive proportions. In this context, it is important to have in mind that in spite of the legislation enacted by the colonial government to establish a merit system for employees in the insular civil service (in 1907 and then again in 1931)--nothing similar was attempted at the municipal levels--[121] such a system would not be established in practice in most governmental agencies until the 1920s. Illustrative of this is that

between 1912 to 1930 more than half of the appointments to the insular civil service were of a temporary character, thus falling outside of the merit system and subject to political patronage.[123] Political favoritism permeated even the appointment of teachers in the public school system where rules and procedures along a meritocratic line were more elaborated--at least formally--than in most other governmental agencies.[124]

Schooling Between 1900 and 1930

Aside from describing the general political and socio-economic trends in Puerto Rico during the first three decades of this century, that is, the background socio-historical forces which helped to shape the development of educational institutions during these decades, the previous sections of this Chapter also touched on various of the demands and positions of the local political and organized social groupings with respect to some of the educational policies--for instance, those regarding "Americanization", the English language issue, and the differential emphasis on mass primary schooling and secondary and university--pursued during this period by the U.S. colonial authorities. Having in mind then the active role of these various insular forces in shaping

local educational developments, this section will focus more closely on the major educational policies and programs pursued by U.S. colonial authorities during this period. One must of course remember that whatever might have been the collaborative or oppositional influence of the insular social forces, it was the colonial government who had the ultimate power to shape educational developments in Puerto Rico.

As was pointed out in Chapter IV, since the beginning of their rule over Puerto Rico, U.S. colonial authorities took decisive steps to ensure their educational hegemony over all Puerto Rican social groupings--including those who favored the "Americanization" of the Island--by rapidly centralizing in their hands the decision-making and administrative power of the insular public school system. In so doing, they assumed that they could secure more efficiently the "Americanization" of the Puerto Rican people. As was advanced in the first section of this Chapter, such centralization was carried to a much higher degree than that ever achieved under the military regime with the passage of the Foraker Act and the School Laws enacted subsequently under the framework of this Act. This was particularly evident in the position of the head of the insular public educational system, the Commissioner of Education, whose duties and responsibilities were set as

follows by Section 23 of the School Law of 1901:

> The Commissioner of Education, being required by act (i.e. the Foraker Act) of Congress of April 12, 1900, to supervise education in Puerto Rico, he shall, to comply with said act, appoint from time to time supervisors, or superintendents of schools, who shall be subject to the Commissioner in all respects; he shall prepare and promulgate all courses of study; conduct all examinations, prepare and issue all licenses or certificates to teachers; select and purchase all school books, supplies and equipments necessary for the proper conduct of education; approve of all plans for public school buildings to be erected in Puerto Rico; require and collect such statistics and reports from all school boards, supervisors or superintendents and teachers as he may require; and formulate such rules and regulations that he may from time to time find necessary for the effective administration of his office.[125]

It is pertinent to note in this context that these dispositions are still included almost without any change in the educational laws which are presently in effect on the Island as can be seen in Section 142 of Title 3 of the Title 3 of the Annotated Laws of Puerto Rico. Indeed, while a number of amendments have been made since its enactment to the 1901 law, these have resulted on the whole in the extension of the powers and duties of the Commissioner (later called Secretary) of Education as well as in the greater centralization and bureaucratization of the educational system.[126]

While the School Law of 1901 gave the Commissioner of Education ample centralized powers in the administration of public education, it still provided for municipal school

boards composed of three elected members. These local boards, however, retained little decision-making powers and autonomy regarding educational matters, their main duties being reduced basically to the renting and maintaining of school buildings and to the nomination of school teachers and principals who had to be approved by the Commissioner of Education.[127] In 1919, moreover, the elected local boards were eliminated and its limited responsibilities were transferred to a Municipal Commissioner of Education (later called School Director) appointed by each municipal assembly.[128] In any event, since 1901 and continuing after 1919, the main educational officials at the local level were the district supervisors, also known as superintendent of schools, who were appointed by the Commissioners. The district supervisors were basically the administrative representative of the Commissioner at the local level, in charge of transmitting to their subordinates (the local administrative and teaching staff) the orders of the Commissioner, of inspecting the execution of those orders and the overall school work at the district level, and of reporting annually to the Commissioners on local school conditions.[129] From 1901 to 1925 the number of district supervisors increased from 16 to 45,[130] an increase reflecting not merely the growth during this period of school enrollment and of the teaching staff--a point to

which this Chapter will return later--but also the increasing centralization and bureaucratization of the control and administration of the insular school system. This increasing centralization and bureaucratization was also evident in the multiplication of supervisory and administrative bureaus, divisions, officials and personnel in the central office of the Department of Education, all very hierarchically organized and under the direct authority of the Commissioner.[131]

In addition to the above listed responsibilities of the Commissioner of Education, one must add those regarding the administration of the University of Puerto Rico. The 1903 law which created the University made the Commissioner of Education the President of its Board of Trustees as well as its Chancellor.[132] This arrangement was maintained until 1923-1925 when the insular legislature with the strong backing not only of the colonial governor but also of most Unionist leaders in the Alianza Party passed a series of laws separating the office of Chancellor of the University from that of the Commissioner of Education.[133] According to the new arrangement, the Chancellor was to be appointed by the University's Board of Trustees which still remained under the presidency of the Commissioner.[134] It should be noted in passing that this new administrative arrangement was strongly opposed by the Commissioner of Education at

that time--Juan B. Huyke, of whom more will be said below--on the ground that it weakened his powers as head of the Department of Education.[135] Of course, this argument had some element of truth, though one should not forget that even so, the Commissioner of Education still retained an enormous amount of centralized control over the public school system.

It is also worth recalling that under the framework of the Foraker Act the Commissioner of Education not only enjoyed the above mentioned highly centralized executive prerogatives but had in addition legislative ones given that as a cabinet member of the Executive Council he was also a member of the upper house of the insular legislature. No doubt, these legislative prerogatives greatly facilitated the passage of legislation prepared and pressed by him, including those measures which concentrated even more power in the position of Commissioner of Education.[136] Moreover, since the upper house had veto power over the House of Delegates, the Commissioner of Education was in a position from which he could easily block any legislation in conflict with the official educational policies. Such was the case in 1913 and 1915 when the Commissioner of Education and the Executive Council blocked two bills proposed and/or passed by the Unionist-dominated House of Delegates which

declared--in direct opposition to the official language policy of the colonial government--Spanish as the language of instruction in the Island's public schools.[137] More on this point below.

The 1917 Jones Act eliminated the legislative prerogatives of the Commissioner of Education and of all cabinet members by separating the Executive Council from the upper legislative house while making elective this latter body. But, as pointed out before, the Jones Act left the appointment of the insular Commissioner of Education as well as that of the Attorney General and Auditor in the hands of the U.S. President, while the rest of the cabinet members were made appointees of the Island's governor, a measure which, as mentioned previously, apparently responded to the interest of the Federal authorities in Washington of ensuring their direct control over the rapid implementation of the "Americanization" policies in such crucial areas as education and the legal-judicial system.[138]

It is worth interjecting here that from 1921 to 1948 the U.S. presidents would appoint Puerto Ricans as insular Commissioners of Education; but while these appointments gave some members of the local elites substantial responsibilities in the direction of the Island's public educational system, there was no question that the govern-

ment in Washington retained the ultimate authority in educational matters. In fact, this would be made dramatically obvious both in the 1930s and in the 1940s when two of the presidentially appointed Commissioners of Education--Jose Padin (1930-37) and Mariano Villaronga (1946-47)--were pressured into resignation by the authorities in Washington when the former attempted to use Spanish as the language of instruction in public schools, attempts in effect to change the official school policy of giving primary priority to the teaching of English that had prevailed in the public educational system since the beginning of U.S. colonial rule.[139] These post-1930 developments fall of course outside of the period of concern of this study. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the only Puerto Rican Commissioner of Education appointed within the time limits of this study, Juan B. Huyke (1921-30), was even previous to his appointment to that position, an ardent advocate not merely of the eventual incorporation of Puerto Rico as a state of the U.S., but also of the rapid "Americanization" of the Island. And from the beginning of his administration, he made very clear his intentions of using the school system to "Americanize" Puerto Rico. As he expressed in one of his typical remarks: "Our schools are agencies of Americanism. They must implant the spirit of America within the hearts of our children."[140] Further-

more, during his administration, Huyke pressed with great fervor the "Americanization" and English language policies carried over by his North American predecessors in the direction of the insular public school system.[141]

It is important to stress here that "Americanization" continued to be the term used by U.S. colonial officials throughout the first 3 decades of this century to characterize the primary and overriding goal of their educational policies. Thus, one observes in this period a great emphasis in the intensification of the teaching of English and in efforts to make it the language of instruction in public schools; in the use of English textbooks and readers, of U.S. teachers and teaching materials; in the sending of young Puerto Ricans, especially future teachers, to the U.S. to pursue secondary and advanced studies and in so doing, quickly acquaint them with the English language and with North American customs and styles; in the celebration of U.S. holidays and patriotic exercises. On the other hand, one observes also the relegation of the study of the Spanish language, Puerto Rican traditions and its history to a secondary if not--like in the latter two cases--marginal importance in the school curricula. There is no need to go into great detail here on the various aspects of the "Americanization" efforts, for these had been amply documented by several

authors, most notably by Aida Negrón de Montilla in her important study on the insular public school system.[142]

Even a superficial examination of the rhetoric of the colonial governors and Commissioners of Education of Puerto Rico during the 1900-1930 period--as expressed, for example, in their annual reports and circular letters--cannot fail to see their persistent insistence of making the public school system a central if not the main agency of "Americanization" in the Island. Aside from Victor S. Clark, whose activities as head of the insular public school system under the military regime were examined in Chapter IV, perhaps no other U.S. colonial official articulated better and in the broadest terms this "Americanization" role of the school system, than Samuel M. Lindsay, the second Commissioner of Education of Puerto Rico (1902-1904) under the Foraker Act. As he stated in the first of his annual reports:

> ... the work of primary and elementary education established here is based on the foundation of the traditions of the best American schools... It is worthy of the enthusiastic support of the community, and it is bound to be, as time goes on, the most important factor in the extension of American principles of government, ideals of conduct of life, knowledge and attainment in culture and service.[143]

On another occasion, Commissioner Lindsay went a step further in describing the basic role that an American school system should play in "Americanizing" the different

social sectors of the Puerto Rican people. He stated accordingly:

> The education problem of Porto Rico (sic) is two-fold. The masses must be taught to read and write, and to know something of the elementary branches of study, and to understand the simpler institutions of American rule. This work is being done, as rapidly as the funds allow, by the different grades of the public schools. Quite a different sort of education is also necessary,--the training of leaders,--of men whose culture shall not be alien and incidental as that too often is which comes from abroad, but which shall be indisseverably bound up with the progress of the Island, and united with our national ideals. The makers of public opinion, and those who shall hold responsible positions in government, in professional life, in business and in society must have in their own Island an opportunity for higher training.[144]

These latter remarks are particularly interesting for they roughly anticipate not only the fundamental concern of subsequent Commissioners in "Americanizing" the Puerto Rican people but also their basic dual (mass-elite) orientation in attempting to Americanize different social sectors of the insular population, an issue to which this section will return below.

The only major emphasis not explicitly articulated in these and the preceding quoted remarks, but which nevertheless is clearly and frequently underlined elsewhere in these documents as well as in most of the reports, writings and policy measures of Lindsay and subsequent Commissioners of Education, was that referring to the teaching of English, which had as its ultimate end the transformation of the

Puerto Rican people into English-speaking people. The colonial officials conceived--and acted as if--the teaching of the English language was not merely an essential aspect of the "Americanization" process, but also a fundamental prerequisite of it, an attitude which echoed of course that of the educational authorities during the military regime and which was very well summoned up by Eaton in the following remarks (quoted more extensively in the preceeding Chapter):

> The absence of the English language furnished the greatest difficulty in the way of those who wished to become American in thought, belief and loyalty... To them, the gaining of the knowledge of English is the medium through which they will become acquainted with the principles of American liberty, with American affairs, American commerce and trade, and thereby share their benefits.[145]

Not surprisingly, Victor S. Clark, who shared basically this view when he was assistant and the successor of Eaton as head of the insular school system in 1899-1900, would insist again thirty years later--now as director of the staff of the Brookings Institution which conducted the important and comprehensive study on the political, social and economic conditions of the Island entitled Puerto Rico and its Problems--on the fundamental importance of the teaching of English in Puerto Rican schools. Thus, continuing the same line of justification used during this 30 year period by succeeding colonial and educational

authorities, Clark stated on this occasion that:

> ... English is the chief source, practically the only source, of democratic ideas in Puerto Rico. There may be little that they (primary grade students) learn to remember, but the English school reader itself provides a body of ideas and concepts which are not to be had in any other way. It is also the only means which these people have of communication with and understanding of the country which they are part.[146]

It is important to note that this consistent placement of the teaching of English as the principal aspect of the "Americanization" process and, consequently, as the principal goal of the public school system was not merely a rhethorical emphasis for it was indeed made the primary concrete and practical concern of the colonial educational authorities of this period. English teaching absorbed, for instance, the largest financial resources and time that was alloted to any of the subjects taught in public schools and this aside from the fact that for years English was made the medium of instruction in all or some school grades.[147] As was advanced before, this primary and over-riding concern with the teaching of English was the thorniest political problem which the colonial educational authorities had to tackle, provoking, particularly since the 1910s, a strong public support of the FLT and the Socialist and Republican parties on the one side, and on the other, the vigorous opposition of the autonomist and

pro-independence wings of the Unionist Party as well as from the various pro-independence groups which split from this political organization (the Independence, Nationalist and Liberal parties) and from the increasingly militant Puerto Rican Teachers Association. While these latter political and professional groups were not opposed to the teaching of English per se, and though occassionally they made reference approvingly to a Spanish-English bilingual educational policy, they initiated nonetheless a long struggle in defense of the vernacular, strongly favoring the use of Spanish as the medium of instruction, and forcefully opposing the use of English for such a purpose. But it should be noted that, however articulate and vigorous was the resistance of those groups to the language policies of the colonial educational administrators, this was not the only grave difficulty encountered by the latter in their implementation of such policies.[148] In addition, they had to face a population whose vernacular was Spanish and who despite of its apparent eagerness to learn, read and write English, was highly unfamiliar with this alien language and had great difficulties in learning it, especially if its teaching and most of the curriculum (except the teaching of Spanish as a subject) was to be based on the sole use of English as the medium of instruction. Furthermore, the colonial administrators found

themselves continually with a critical shortage of competent and sensitive English teachers and effective English teaching materials for such a massive and rapidly increasing population, and this in spite of the enormous increase of the teaching staff during the 1900-1930 period, and of the repeated efforts of the colonial authorities to upgrade the English competencies of local teachers. On top of this, the efforts in the teaching of English were furthered hampered by the various shifts in policies regarding the language question which were undertaken by the Commissioners of Education, shifts which responded in part to their attempts to address the failures or limitations of the preceeding Commissioners in extending and expanding the teaching of English, but also in part to their attempts to overcome the articulate resistance of the above mentioned political and teachers groups as well as the passive resistance of large sectors of the target population to the previous efforts of using English as the only medium of instruction.

At least, four phases in the language policies can be distinguished during the 1900-1930 period:

1. The first, from 1900 to 1904, covering the administrations of Brumbaugh (1900-1901) and of Lindsay (1902-1904)--respectively the first and second Commissioners of Education under the Foraker Act--, was characterized by a

policy of bilingualism geared to the conservation of Spanish and the rapid acquisition of English, and in which the vernacular was instituted as the language of instruction in the primary grades (1-8), while English was to be the language of instruction in the high schools and was to be introduced as a subject in all the grades of the elementary school. This policy was in large measure a continuation of the one initiated by Victor S. Clark at the end of this administration as head of the insular public school system under the military regime, a policy to which, as was mentioned in Chapter IV, he resorted after his initial policy of using English as the sole medium of instruction in schools was not just failing in terms of effectively teaching more children English, but also significantly hindering the overall expansion of primary schooling. In any case, while both Clark and the first two Commissioners of Education under the civil regime pursued a bilingual policy, they also retained the view that this was a transitional measure and expected that eventually, with the increasing emphasis on the teaching of English and with a large enough teaching staff competent in English, this language would become the sole medium of instruction and the dominant language of the Island.

2. The second phase, from 1904 to 1916, included the

administration of Commissioners Falkner (1904-1907), Dexter (1907-1912), Bainter (1912-1915), and the first year of the administration of Miller (1915-1921). This phase was characterized by the extensive efforts of these Commissioners to make English the medium of instruction in all the grades of the school system except in the teaching of Spanish as a subject, a reversion thus to the initial language policy of both Eaton and Clark. Moreover, this intensification in English instruction was complemented by an intensification of the efforts in preparing Puerto Rican teachers in the English language, efforts which included, among other things, the passage of measures requiring the compulsory attendance of all native teachers to English classes every year and laws mandating the annual examination of all teachers. The emphasis on the English language was particularly extreme during the administration of Dexter, who decreed that the reading of English be taught in the first grade before children were taught to read Spanish. Under Dexter, moreover, the intensification in English instruction was extended for the first time to rural schools. And, indeed, by the end of this incumbency as Commissioner in 1912, Dexter reported very proudly on his main achievements: 98.4 percent of all primary schools in the urban areas were taught wholly in English, while in rural schools, already 60 percent were taught English as a

special subject, 17 percent were taught wholly in English and 22 percent were taught partly in the same language.[149]

It is worth remembering that it was particularly the English policy persued by Dexter and continued by Bainter, especially their attempts at using English exclusively as the medium of instruction and at requiring native teachers to take English classes and English examinations, which provoked the growth and initial struggles of the movement in opposition to the use of English as the medium of instruction and in defense of the Spanish language, a movement led by the Puerto Rican Teachers Association (whose foundation in 1911 was incidentally motivated in large part by the growing criticism by native teachers of the English policies of Flakner and Dexter) and strongly backed by a large sector of the Unionist Party. Indeed, it may be that the language policies pursued by the colonial educational administrators of this period were a major contributor to the growth of autonomist and pro-independence sentiments within the ranks of the Unionist Party, a development of course also related to the delays of Washington in reforming the colonial framework of the Foraker Act. Expressions of this growing nationalist sentiment were not only the rejections of the leadership of this party to the various attempts of Congress to grant Puerto Ricans collective U.S. citizenship, but also the

passage by the Unionist-controlled House of Delegates of several bills addressing in particular the school language policy. Two of the bills, one presented in 1913 and the other in 1915, provided for making Spainish the language of instruction in primary schools (1 to 8 grades), the second going further than the first one by providing also that the Spanish language had to be used in all judicial processes.[150] Both bills, however, were blocked by the Executive Council, the upper house of the insular legislature--which included the Commissioner of Education as one of its members--but not before generating considerable public debate and student demonstrations in various high schools, principally in those located in the capital, in support of those Unionists bills. In other related legislative measures, however, the Unionists were able to get the approval of the Executive Council and this despite the opposition of the education Commissioner. Such was the case, for instance, of the passage in 1913 of a bill abolishing both the annual classes in English and the yearly English examination which were required of teachers.[151]

3. Partly in response to these pressures from the Unionist Party and the Teachers Association, and partly in response to the dramatic failure of the policy of using English solely as the medium of instruction--as revealed by the mounting evidence collected by the insular Department

of Education showing not only a very low achievement of students in English, but also that a large majority of them were leaving schools before the fourth grade without learning to read either language--[152] Commissioner Miller (1915-1921) initiated in 1916 a new phase of the language policy which was continued under Huyke (1921-1930) and up to 1934, that is, during the first years of the administration of Padin (1930-1937). This new phase consisted basically in the use of Spanish as the language of instruction in grades 1-4 and English in grades 6-8 as well as in high schools, the fifth grade was a grade of transition where half of the subjects were taught in English and half in Spanish. In a sense, this new phase represented a softening of the previous emphasis in the teaching of English in the first 5 grades of primary school, but the teaching of this language in these grades continued to be strongly emphasized and so was the learning and use of English of teachers of all grades. In the meantime, not only was English maintained as the sole language of instruction after the fifth grade, but efforts were redoubled in those levels regarding its use and teaching, particularly during Huyke's administration. Thus, among other things, all high school seniors were obliged to pass an oral English examination before receiving their diplomas, principals and teachers were urged to speak to students in

English, and teachers were advised that those of them "unable or unwilling to teach in English may be asked to resign."[153]

It should be pointed out, moreover, that during this new phase of the English policy, the commissioners of education maintained with renewed vigor the efforts to make Puerto Ricans loyal and patriotic citizens of the U.S., efforts characterized by the intensification of such activities as the singing of North American patriotic songs, salutes to the U.S. flag, the instruction in North American history, and the celebration of U.S. holidays and of the deeds of North American civic and military heroes.[154] It is worth having in mind that while these activities had been emphasized by educational officials since the beginning of U.S. colonial rule over the Island, they were given greater attention since 1917, in part as a result of the involvement of the U.S. in World War I which triggered the momentary endeavors of Commissioner Miller in promoting the patriotic support of the Puerto Ricans for the war efforts of the U.S. But perhaps more important in explaining this renewed emphasis was that the granting of collective U.S. citizenship to the Islanders in 1917--an event of course not unrelated to the participation of the U.S. in the European war conflict for, as was discussed in the first section of this Chapter, such involvement precipitated in

large measure the passage of the Jones Act and the extension of U.S. citizenship to the Puerto Rican people--provided to both Miller and Huyke a deeper justification for their "Americanization" policies and particularly for their efforts to make Puerto Ricans loyal and patriotic citizens of the U.S.[155]

Despite the apparent softening of the educational officials regarding the intensification of English instruction and despite the passage of the Jones Act and the granting of U.S. citizenship in 1917, both Miller and Huyke had to face persistent opposition from the Unionist Party and the Teachers Association as well as continued demonstrations of student protest, principally again in the high schools of the capital but also increasingly at the University of Puerto Rico.[156] It must be remembered that this opposition and unrest were fueled not merely by the still great and obsessive emphasis of the educational authorities in the teaching of English and in the "Americanization" process, but also by the overall political situation of the Island whose colonial status changed little with the Jones Act. These circumstances gave the student struggle an increasing nationalist orientation, a development that nurtured and, at the same time, was reinforced by the pro-independence wing of the Unionist Party and later, after 1922 when the Unionist Party

eliminated the independence plank from its platform, by the Nationalist Party, founded in that same year by a group of ex-Unionists. Though the student protest movement and its nationalist orientation did not acquire massive momentum until the 1930s, its activism during the late 1910s and during the 1920s was militant enough to provoke strong repressive measures from both Miller and Huyke as well as from the university authorities, measures which included summary expulsions or suspensions of students who had only collected signatures or written letters in favor of the independence of the Island or in protest of some of the official "Americanization" measures.[157] And indeed both Miller and Huyke went so far as to assure university students who planned to enter the teaching profession that if they held views contrary to the "Americanization" policies of the educational authorities or if their loyalty to the U.S. was in doubt, they would not be appointed as teachers of the public school system.[158]

Interestingly, during the second half of the 1920s there was at the University a certain degree of relaxation in the level of protest of students as well as in the repressive attitude of the educational authorities, a development due in large part to the administrative reorganization of the University during 1923-1925 and by certain academic changes introduced there between 1925-1929 under

the administration of Chancellor Beener.[159] As stated previously, during 1923-1925 the University was separated from the Department of Education, and hence from under the direct control of Commissioner Juan B. Huyke.[160] This move, along with a provision giving the University an independent source of income, facilitated some degree of autonomy in educational policy. This was more clearly evident in the great impetus that was given to the study of the Spanish language and literature, especially after the founding of the Department of Hispanic Studies in 1927. Such impetus, by the way, was reinforced by a policy of inviting prominent Spanish and Latin American scholars and literary figures. In one sense, these new academic emphases went a long way in meeting the opposition and criticism of students against the policies of cultural "Americanization" in the University and contributed accordingly to their momentary pacification; but those same developments appear to have been very decisive in furthering the nationalist orientation of the student movement, and thus in paving the way for their renewed political militancy in the 1930s as well as to the renewed rounds of authoritarism and repression on the part of the University authorities.[161]

Whether at the University or at the primary and secondary levels, it is not difficult to argue that the prevailing authoritarian and repressive tendencies were in

direct contradiction to any effort in educating for self-government or for a democratic society. As has been stated before, the latter were among the principal ostensible aims of the "Americanization" policies not just of Miller and Huyke, but of all previous Commissioners of Education and most U.S. colonial officials in Puerto Rico. Nonetheless, it is not difficult to notice that these aims were contradicted not just by the more or less authoritarian and repressive attitudes of those officials, but by the underlying colonial and centralized structure of government that the U.S. maintained over Puerto Rico.

The irony of the whole situation had been already observed, especially in reference to the attempts of U.S. officials to justify the maintenance of an increasingly centralized colonial apparatus with the argument that Puerto Ricans were inexperienced in self-government and that their education in self-government required the strong guiding hand of North Americans and only a gradual extension of political rights. As shown previously, Puerto Ricans made in fact important gains in political rights and participation during this period, but their exercise of self-government at both the insular and municipal levels was nevertheless fundamentally restricted by the centralized, colonial structure of government. And, as has also been shown before, such structure was perhaps no more strikingly evident

than in the Department of Education where power was highly concentrated in the person of the U.S. presidentially appointed Commissioner of Education, whose extensive, hierarchical and bureaucratic control over the whole public school system left little if any room for initiative and decision-making in administrative, curricular, and teaching matters for the middle and lower levels of the administrative and supervisory staff not to mention teachers, students and parents, or community representatives, whether at the insular or local level. Such forms of control might have facilitated a high degree of uniformity in supervisory, teaching and evaluating practices, in teaching materials and even in school buildings; in fact, it might even be argued that it facilitated the expansion of school enrollments, the reduction of illiteracy, the mass instruction of English as well as the mass diffusion of North American ideals and values, including democratic ones. But it is very doubtful that the profoundly hierarchical and even authoritarian character of most of the school system could have allowed for any significant development of democratic skills and habits among any of its participants, whether students, teachers or administrators. It appears, moreover, that teaching itself was characterized on the whole by an overemphasis in rote instruction, the prescription of maxims and the exacting of "right" answers

or "correct" conduct from students; 162 in other words, by a type of instruction which however effective it might have been in informing students about the liberal democratic institutions of the U.S., allowed little room for the critical examination and discussion of social and scientific issues in the classroom, thus depriving students of the opportunity to develop what one might justifiably consider to be basic skills and habits of a democratic citizen.

It is worth observing that while there was undoubtedly very little in the organizational structure of the public school system as a whole or in the teaching interaction itself which could be called democratic or that could lead to the democratic formation of students; it is nevertheless true that the colonial authorities--with wide support in the Island, including the support of both the insular legislature and the municipal governments--made great efforts in providing schooling for as many youths as possible. Tables 3, 10 and 11 provide some indications of such efforts and their results. As shown in Table 10, expenditures of the colonial government on public elementary and secondary education grew considerably between 1900 and 1925 and in general the share of those expenditures as a percentage of the insular and municipal tax receipts was substantial, fluctuating for the most part between 25 and

TABLE 10

Insular and Municipal Expenditures for Public Primary and Secondary Education, 1900-1930

YEAR	TOTAL INSULAR AND MUNICIPAL EXPENDITURES	% OF TOTAL TAX COLLECTIONS SPENT IN EDUCATION	PER PUPIL COSTS
1900	$ 288,098		$ 9.86
1905	878,868	24.85	14.70
1910	1,371,490	26.14	14.38
1915	2,070,496	37.97	12.91
1920	2,956,696	28.29	16.61
1925	5,598,258	44.88	26.01
1930	4,996,780	34.51	22.59

Source: Osuna (1949:620)

TABLE 11

School Attendance Rates by Age-Group, Gender, Color and Urban-Rural Residence

For Puerto Rico, 1899-1930

(In Percentages)

YEAR AGE-GROUP	ALL CLASSES	MALE	FEMALE	WHITE	NONWHITE	URBAN	RURAL
1899							
5-14 years	9.2	10.5	7.9	10.3	7.6	N.A.	N.A.
15-17 years	1.9	3.0	1.0	2.3	1.4	N.A.	N.A.
1910							
5-14 years	38.1	40.6	35.5	39.5	35.6	N.A.	N.A.
7-13 years	45.3	48.5	41.9	46.8	42.5	N.A.	N.A.
15-17 years	22.2	25.7	19.2	24.0	18.8	N.A.	N.A.
1920							
5-14 years	48.3	50.9	45.7	49.3	45.9	N.A.	N.A.
7-13 years	57.8	60.9	54.6	58.9	54.9	72.9	54.3
15-17 years	30.5	34.6	26.7	32.3	25.8	N.A.	N.A.
1930							
5-14 years	43.7	45.2	42.2	44.8	40.9	N.A.	N.A.
7-13 years	56.0	57.7	54.3	57.2	52.8	69.7	51.5
15-17 years	21.4	25.6	17.8	22.6	18.0	N.A.	N.A.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census (1940)

35 percent. Tables 3 and 11 show a significant rise between 1899 and 1930 in the literacy and school attendance rates for the insular population as a whole as well as, it is important to note, for women as much as for men, for non-whites as much as for whites and even for the rural population relative to the urban population, though the gap between these two sectors of the population, in contrast to those differentiated on the basis of gender and color, remained much wider. (More will be said shortly on the urban/rural gap in schooling). And even despite the already noted difficulties in the efforts to teach English, the census figures show a steady increase in the percentage of persons 10 years and over who could speak the English language, rising from 3.6 percent in 1910 to 19.4 percent in 1930, an increase which at least in part could be attributed to those efforts.[163]

The commitment to popular education of the colonial authorities is further evidenced by the primary emphasis they placed on the expansion of elementary education. As can be seen in Tables 11 and 12, this expansion was truly a remarkable achievement and it compared very favorably with the developments in this regard not only in the other dependencies of the U.S. but also with Japan and, for that matter, with those of many countries in the 1950s which had

TABLE 12

Public School Enrollment by Levels

for Puerto Rico, 1899-1930

LEVELS	1899 NUMBER	1900 NUMBER	1900 % Δ	1920 NUMBER	1920 % Δ	1930 NUMBER	1930 % Δ
Grades 1-12	25,644	95,314	272.0	178,035	86.8	221,197	24.2
Grades 1- 6	N.A.	92,520		167,334	80.9	200,985	20.1
Grades 7- 9	N.A.	2,608		8,764	236.0	15,983	82.4
Grades 10-12	N.A.	204		1,937	849.5	4,229	118.3
University	*	376		744	97.9	1,466	97.0
Total Insular Population	953,243	1,118,012	17.3	1,299,809	16.3	1,543,913	18.8

* Established in 1903

Sources: Rodriguez Bou (1966:295)
U.S. Bureau of the Census (1910-1930)

reached Puerto Rico's level of income in the 1920s.[164] Although there was during this period, as shown also in Tables 11 and 12, a rapid growth of public secondary and university education, the public school system as a whole remained essentially a primary school system, and in fact by 1930, 78.5 percent of all the children in the schools were still concentrated in the first 4 grades of school.[165] To be sure, instruction beyond the fourth grade remained basically accessible to only urban middle and upper class children, and the colonial authorities, as illustrated in a previous quoted statement by Lindsay, were not merely resigned to this situtation but also thought that what the Island required was a mass/elite educational system: that is, universal primary schooling for the masses, and secondary and university for the elite who would be trained as the future native leadership--officials in government, professionals, businessmen--under U.S. rule.[166]

Nevertheless, despite the limited accessibility to secondary and university education, it is important to note that a large part of the students who reached these schooling levels were to become teachers in primary schools,[167] a development which may be seem as ultimately reflecting the chief emphasis given to the expansion of primary schooling. This can be seen more clearly in the growth and orientation

of the University of Puerto Rico, by far the major source of post-secondary and professional education on the Island, and which from its foundation in 1903 to 1923, when it was separated in administrative terms from the Department of Education, operated to a very considerable degree as a training center not merely for teachers, but for primary school teachers. Thus, of all the students graduated from the University, between 1903 and 1923, 40.7 percent received certificates in elementary education and 32.3 percent in rural education, the latter being also, essentially, primary education.[168]

In examining the extraordinary efforts of the U.S. colonial authorities in achieving universal primary schooling it must be remembered that while the agro-export economy of Puerto Rico prospered significantly during the first three decades of this century--spearheaded by and benefitting in particular, as described before, the absentee sugar corporations and the financial and service sectors tied to them--allowing for a substantial increase in public revenues; the economy nonetheless continued to underdevelop, leaving the Island still fairly poor and its public revenues still fairly scarce. Furthermore, despite the fact that the colonial authorities spent a large proportion of the insular budget on public education, such expenditures were hardly able to catch up with the rapid

increases in the school-age population. This situation became even more critical during the 1920s, especially after 1925, as public revenues decreased, partly on account of the increasing difficulties of the insular treasury in collecting taxes (particularly, as noted in the preceeding section, from the large sugar corporations), and partly on account of the early onset of the Great Depression in Puerto Rico as a result of the destructive hurricane of September 1928, which incidentaly not only drastically reduced agricultural activity--principally the coffee industry whose crop was devastated--but also destroyed or damaged a great number of school buildings, mainly those in the rural areas.[169] As can be seen from Table 11 school attendance rates increased very little during the 1920s scarcely compensating for the increases in the school-age population, and thus, by 1930 nearly 56.3 percent of the 5-14 years of age population were not attending school. In addition, the holding power of schools continued to be very limited: in 1926, for instance, the Survey Commission from Teachers College reported that 84 percent of the children who entered school left it at the end of the third grade.[170] This is another way of repeating that beyond the third grade, and particularly in the secondary and university levels, schooling remained accessible to few children, namely the sons and daughters of the urban middle and upper classes.

It should be mentioned in this context that in their efforts to incorporate the largest number of children in the school system, the colonial educational authorities initiated the practice of "double enrollment," by which two groups of children were taught in the same classroom and, often, by the same teacher, one group in the morning session and another in the afternoon session.[171] Though double enrollment was also used in some urban schools, principally in the first two grades, it was almost universally practiced in rural schools. Undoubtly, double enrollments made schools accessible to an increased number of rural children who otherwise, given the limited financial resources of the Island, might not have received any schooling; but at the same time, such a practice also helped to reinforce the already persisting inequalities in school opportunities for urban and rural children. For not only were the rural schools generally limited to the first 3 grades, but the instruction time in those grades was, on account of the double enrollments, about half the time alloted in many urban primary schools, and this besides the fact, as noted before, that most schools, with grades beyond the third grade and, surely, all the high schools, were located in the urban areas. Thus, while the enrollment rates for rural children increased significantly between 1900-1930, they remained, as shown in Table 11, far

behind those of urban children: in 1930, for instance, they were respectively 51.5 and 69.7 percent for the 7 and 13 years of age population.

Despite these shortcomings in the expansion of school enrollments, and despite the very limited expansion of mass schooling beyond the third grade of primary school, not to mention the practical monopoly of the still small middle and upper classes of the access to secondary and university education, there is no question that at no other point in the previous history of Puerto Rico was there so large a percentage of the population under the direct influence of State controlled education. The colonial authorities saw this accomplishment, and particularly, their efforts to achieve universal primary schooling, as a clear expression of their deep committment to U.S. democratic and egalitarian traditions. Accordingly, they presented their efforts as the best means of educating the Islanders for self-government, and while this did not preclude in their plans the training of an insular elite to occupy the positions of leadership in government, business and professional life, their priority in such efforts was, to quote again Lindsay, to teach the masses "to read and write, and to know something of the elementary branches of study, and to understand the simpler institutions of American rule."[173]

It may be argued with some justification that literacy and even arithmetic are essential skills for the effective participation of informed citizens in a democratic self-governing society and that even within the colonial framework of the Island, the learning of such skills may have provided an important access to the various sources of information and public debate in the Island, especially that available in the printed news media which as a matter of fact included a variety of partisan newspapers with different political views, including incidently, those of the Socialist Party.[174]

On the other hand, it must be considered that however useful the learning of literacy and arithmetic skills might have been for democratic citizenship, they were also, at any rate, very useful for government and business as devices for ensuring not only efficient operation, but also effective social and ideological control. This appears to have been especially true of the moderninzing State apparatusses and business organizations which were becoming, like in the case of Puerto Rico's colonial administration (including its public school system) and agro-export economy (as particularly represented by the sugar corporations), increasingly large-scale centralized and bureaucratized in character, and hence greatly dependent on written materials--e.g. written reports, rules and

regulations--as mechanisms of administrative efficiency and social and ideological control. In this respect, it must also be kept in mind that the teaching of literacy and arithmetic skills was realized in a highly undemocratic setting (what in recent times has been termed the "hidden curriculum") which placed more emphasis in developing habits of punctuality and cleanliness and attitudes of conformity and deference towards figures of authority in public, business and professional life, rather than in developing capacities for critical thinking and democratic participation. Indeed, even more important in this respect was the concern, as shown earlier in this section, of cultivating those skills and attitudes more consistent with the process of "Americanization": namely, English oral and literacy skills, and loyalty to the institutions of U.S. rule. Examined then in terms of social and ideological control, there is no doubt that the colonial authorities attained very quickly a greater degree of educational influence over wide sections of the insular population than ever attained by Spanish colonial rulers.

It has been frequently said that U.S. colonial educational policy in Puerto Rico was marked by a strong pragmatic or utilitarian orientation, and this has usually been said as a way of contrasting it with the allegedly non-utilitarian or idealistic orientation of Spanish

colonial educational policy.[175] It is certainly true that the Spaniards, whether through the State or the Church, never managed to set up an efficient and centralized school system capable of extending its direct influence over a wide sector of the insular population; it is also true that their curricular orientation was highly literary and moralistic in character, firmly situated within the classical liberal arts tradition and much influenced if not controlled by Spanish Catholicism. But as shown in Chapters II and II, it is also true that such curricular orientation not only had a clear utility for the State and the Church in terms of securing ideological allegience from the schooled, particularly at the elementary level, but had in addition, especially at the secondary and university levels, a clear and definite vocational role in the training of the clergy, colonial bureaucrats, independent professionals and teachers. Moreover, it must be remembered that particularly during the 19th century there was a growing interest and occasional efforts not only among professionals and artisans but also among governmental officials in both the metropolis and the colony, in promoting and establishing a variety of forms of so-called "useful" or "practical" education, whether through trade or industrial schools, or, in a minor scale, through the incorporation of courses in the curriculum of primary and

secondary schools in such areas as agriculture, manual and technical training, commerce and science. On the other hand, even though there was no post-secondary schools or universities on the Island, some degree of scientific and professional training (e.g. for teachers, pharmacists, engineers) was provided in a variety of small independent establishments and academic chairs. Thus, there was already in existence within Spanish education a clear beginning of what one may call utilitarian forms of education and this notwithstanding the fact that Spanish educational efforts remained on the whole less effective and extensive than those of the North Americans.

On the other hand, the educational utilitarianism or pragmatism of the latter must not be exaggerated. As has been already shown, U.S. colonial authorities were certainly much more diligent and successful than their Spanish counterparts in setting up a highly centralized and bureaucratized public school system capable of achieving a large degree of mass schooling in the Island, with uniform standards and effective ways of supervising instruction and maintaining students and teachers under control. In this regard too, they were clearly more effective in providing to the insular masses training not only in literacy and arithmetic skills, but also in the habits of punctuality, conformity and subservience, all of

which as noted before, could be seen as very useful for the hierarchical and bureaucratic social order being institutionalized in the Island by the colonial government and the U.S. agro-export corporations. Moreover, it can easily be shown by a quick examination of the educational reports of U.S. colonial authorities, that they were especially outspoken in emphasizing the importance for the Island of what they considered directly "practical" or "useful" forms of education, including here not only manual training, technical or vocational education, whether in the agricultural, commercial or industrial fields or in "home economics", but also in such areas as science, health and physical education. Even so, when it comes to the actual developments in these forms of schooling, the accomplishments were rather limited, and on the whole, by 1930, the curriculum of the public primary and secondary schools was still primarily traditional, literary or bookish in character, a conclusion incidentally also reached by the major government sponsored studies of the period, including those of the Teachers College's Commission in 1926 and of the Brookings Institute in 1930.[176]

During the first decade of U.S. colonial rule there were indeed important attempts at making education directly relevant to the economic developments of the Island as was

the case in particular with the establishment of the so-called agricultural and industrial schools. As early as 1902-1903 there were as many as 19 of the agricultural schools, which were special rural schools that in addition to offering the ordinary elementary curriculum, were supposed to provide, along with a school garden, 2 hours of instruction in the "cultivation of the soil and the raising of the ordinary vegetables and farm products" and experimentation with "the scientific cultivation of plants in which the agricultural community in the neighborhood of the school might be interested."[177] But in spite of the initial enthusiasm, these schools were hardly able to accomplish their purposes, not merely because of a lack of prepared teachers and necessary equipment, but also because at the time, the priority of the Department of Education was in theextension of primary schools in the urban areas. As a result, very soon after their establishment, many of the agricultural schools were turned into ordinary rural schools.[178]

The development of the industrial schools was also problematical, but perhaps in a more dramatic sense. Between 1903 and 1907, 5 industrial schools were established in the main cities of the Island (San Juan, Ponce, Mayaguez, Arecibo, and Guayama). Students were supposed to enter this school at the sixth grade level and the plan

of their program provided for 4 years of school training, two in general manual training and two in trade specialization: the latter by the way, conceived pretty much along sex/gender differentiated lines, boys doing mainly woodwork, plumbing and mechanical drawing, and girls doing cooking, sewing and basketweaving.[179] (Regarding cooking and sewing, it should be remembered that these so-called female activities were not merely tasks performed in the patriarchal home, but also as noted in the previous section, among the main activities of women--especially as workers in the needle industries--in a patriarchally organized labor market.) While there was apparently certain student demand for this form of schooling, these schools seemed to have encountered similar problems as the agricultural schools in terms of the lack of prepared teachers and adequate equipment. But more fatal to their continued existence was that they fell victim to a power struggle between the Department of Education and the House of Delegates; a conflict triggered by an attempt of the Unionists, then in absolute control of the House of Delegates, to gain substantial power over the selection of the directors and teachers of these schools. The Commissioner of Education opposed such a move, and so did the Executive Council, of which he was a member, a situation which led to an impasse between the two

legislative houses and to the eventual failure of the legislature--in 1907--to appropriate funds for industrial schooling, resulting accordingly in the definite closing of those schools.[180]

After the closing of the industrial schools, and throughout the rest of the period covered in this Chapter, only two public schools were established on the Island (in San Juan and Ponce) specialized in some form of "industrial" vocational training.[181] However, during the 1910s the so-called "manual training" and "home economics" courses were introduced as required special subjects of the curriculum in the middle level grades of the public schools system (manual training from six to ten, and "home economics" generally from the seventh to the eleventh grade), mostly in the urban schools.[182] The manual training/home economics distinction marked a clear sex/gender differential which paralleled the one made earlier in the industrial schools, for manual training was for boys, and consisted mainly of courses in mechanical drawing and woodwork, whereas home economics was exclusively for girls and included training in the whole gamut of so-called female home activities: principally, home management, home hygiene, the caring of children and the sick, cooking and sewing. It is interesting to note that while the program in manual training appeared to have been largely

academic and abstract in character, with little direct practical training, as well as little practical relevence to the interests of the children, the needs of the surrounding community, or the demands of the insular economy; the "home economic" program appeared to have been very effective in providing such direct and functional practical training especially in the area of needlework. Training in the needlecrafts, still within the home economic program, was given even more emphasis by the educational authorities, particularly between 1915 and 1925, largely in response to the demands of the expanding needle industry--whose growth was described in the preceding section of this Chapter. As such, training in needlework required a directly vocational character and indeed it could be said that of all the major industries of the Island, including in this respect the sugar industry, it was only the needle industry that found a direct training counterpart in the insular primary and secondary school system. However, even vocational training in needlework had a "checkered career", for in 1925 there was a budget slash that wiped out the financial support for it as well as other parts of the home economic program, a situation from which there would not by any recuperation until the 1930s.[183]

Two rather interesting developments in the direction of

"practical" or "utilitarian" education during the period of concern here were the school and home garden movement that began at the end of the First World War and the "second-unit rural school" program that began in 1928. The food shortages and high food prices which resulted in the U.S. because of the war, affected even more Puerto Rico, given its increased dependence on the U.S. mainland for food supplies as the sugar and tobacco industry monopolized substantial sectors of its cultivated lands. To face this emergency, the colonial authorities gave special attention to stimulating insular food production for domestic consumption and local trade, an initiative which included attempts to increase the area of food cultivation as well as special efforts of the Department of Education in promoting the cultivation of home and school gardens.[184] As part of these efforts, school gardens were established in many rural schools, and boys as well as girls were taught to cultivate home gardens. The program was apparently successful and it continued throughout the 1920s, even though after the First World War the government lost much of its interest in increasing local food production as trade with the U.S. normalized and the Island relapsed to its previous dependence on U.S. food imports.[185]

The "second-unit rural schools" were, according to the official description, "consolidated rural schools of a

vocational type."[186] These schools went from grades four to eight, and their curriculum included in addition to a shortened version of the traditional elementary curriculum, vocational subjects--again sex/gender differentiated--for boys, agriculture, animal husbandry, woodwork, house wiring, auto mechanics, shoe repairing, hair cutting, clay work, and toymaking; for girls, cooking, sewing, hand and machine embroidery and lace making. Much was expected from these schools and they were seen as pioneer agents of overall social, cultural, and economic development of the rural areas, or, as one Puerto Rican Commissioner of Education put it, as "the most promising agency at our disposal for improving the unsatisfactory conditions under which our peasants live."[187] The second-unit rural schools grew rapidly in number--by 1930 there were 12, and they continued to increase during the following decades--and it appears that they were rather successful in their vocational training and in responding to the needs of the communities where they were located.[188] But it is very doubtful that they served in any effective way or significant degree to improve the conditions of the rural population, which, not surprisingly, got even worse after 1929 and through the 1930s, that is, through the Depression years.

Another source of vocational-like education provided

in the insular public schools system during the 1900-1930 period was the "commercial" program offered in high schools since 1905, as a parallel, alternative educational track to the "general" college-preparatory program.[189] What made it a "commercial" program was chiefly a curriculum with courses in stenography, typewriting, business arithmetic and bookkeeping. At any rate, the program enrolled a small percentage of the high school students, and, for instance, in 1929-1930, of the 920 high school graduates, only 110 students, that is, 12 percent, were from the commercial program.[190]

On the whole, then, despite this program and the manual arts and home economics subjects that were incorporated in their curriculum, high schools on the Island remained essentially academic, college preparatory institutions. It is interesting to note however, that even this form of academic training, had for many high school students, a directly vocational function, for in spite of its "college-preparatory" character, it provided its graduates with sufficient formal qualifications for entering into the clerical and low-level white collar occupations of the expanding governmental and business bureaucracies.[191]

As could be expected, the formal training for the middle and high level positions of those bureaucracies as

well as for the various professions was provided chiefly by the University of Puerto Rico, the major post-secondary institution on the Island. But before considering the vocational offerings of this institution, it should be kept in mind that while it was the older and by far the major post-secondary school on the Island it was not the only source of such schooling available for Puerto Ricans. Not only were there two very small Protestant institutions of that type operating during the 1920s, of which more will be said later, but more important, there were also the universities and colleges of the U.S. mainland. In a sense, these universities and colleges constituted the apex of the Puerto Rican school system, much the same way that Spain's (or Cuba's) universities and colleges' served as the apex of the insular school system during the 19th century. Not only were the insular elites eager to send their children to the institutions of higher learning in the U.S., but they got the strong support of the colonial authorities and insular legislature, and a large number of scholarships were granted for such a purpose.[192] As suggested before, previous to the foundation of the University of Puerto Rico in 1903, the colonial authorities were greatly concerned with sending Puerto Ricans to do university and professional studies in the U.S., particularly to be trained as teachers; expecting in this way to accelerate the "Americanization"

of the Island by quickly incorporating a large sector of the insular elites as leaders and mediators of such a process. With the establishment of the University of Puerto Rico, scholarships to U.S. universities and colleges decreased; but the latter, especially the most prestigious among them, continued to function as the real upper level institutions of higher education for the local elites.[193] A status reinforced by the fact that even by 1930, as shall be seen shortly, the insular University remained predominately a two-year junior college--in 1926 the Teachers College's Commission described it as a two-year junior college--[194] with only small and underdeveloped four year bachelor, professional and graduate programs. These latter programs, and particularly the upper level graduate ones, were provided by U.S. universities, and thus it was these universities the ones which continued to do much of the training for the top professional and academic positions in the Island; a function, incidently, which they have continued to perform up to the present time, and this despite the enormous growth of the insular network of higher institutions since the 1930s.

Even so, one should not underestimate the role of the University of Puerto Rico in providing vocational training for the upper and middle levels of the white collar sectors and specifically for their professional and technocratic

strata. In an important sense, of all the types of schools in existence in Puerto Rico during the first three decades of U.S. rule, it was perhaps the University that had the most lasting, if not the most clearly vocational orientation. As stated earlier, during this period, the University operated chiefly as a training center for teachers, and in fact when it was founded in 1903, it started with only a normal school department. Gradually other departments of professional training were established. In 1904, an agricultural department was organized, but this department did little professional training until 1911 when it was transformed into the College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts.[195] While most of the enrollment of this college was concentrated in the two lower years, (e.g. 80 percent in 1925),[196] it offered a four-year Bachelor of Science degree in Agronomy, in civil, mechanical and electrical engineering, in sugar chemistry and in general science. In all, between 1915 and 1934, the College of Agriculture and Mechanical Arts graduated 186 Agronomists, 102 Civil Engineers, 7 Electrical Engineers, 57 Mechanical Engineers and 56 Chemists.[197] Thus, this college was to a great extent much attuned to the demands of technical and scientific personnel of the colonial government (namely, demands for technicians and managers in the construction and operation of public works, roads, public buildings,

power systems, irrigation systems and agricultural enterprises), and the sugar industry. And it is interesting to note that this was the only form of university training, indeed the only form of insular public or vocational schooling, which was supported by federal funding before the 1930s, for since 1908, the U.S. extended to the University of Puerto Rico the benefits of the Morrill-Hatch funds for the maintenance of a college of agriculture and mechanical arts.[198]

The other professional departments established at the university were: in 1913, the Colleges of Law and Pharmacy; in 1924, the School of Tropical Medicine (which, though it was principally research oriented and not a doctorate degree granting program, offered a certificate in tropical medicine); and in 1926, the School of Business Administration, which granted bachelors in business administration and the "secretarial" sciences as well as a certificate in accounting.[199] Of course, as has been seen in preceding Chapters, none of these occupations were in any sense new for Puerto Rico, as law and pharmacy in particular, along with the teaching professions, were already very popular among the insular elites at the end of the Spanish rule. However, as noted in the preceding section, they increased significantly during the first three decades of this

century, a development triggered in large part by the growing commercialization and bureaucratization of insular life that was promoted by U.S. colonial officials and U.S. business interests. Certainly, such increases were also facilitated by the dramatic increases in mass schooling and, specifically, by the special training provided by the more vocational oriented departments of the University of Puerto Rico.

In connection with this, it is relevant to point out that the primary emphasis given to the vocational or professional aspect of the University, greatly contrasted with the way that the so-called liberal arts were relegated to minor importance. In fact, no program of liberal arts was established in the University until 1910--the College of Liberal Arts--and not until 1915 did the University grant its first degree in a four-year course of liberal arts and science.[200] From then on more importance was placed on the liberal arts and sciences, and even a couple of graduate (masters) programs--the only in the University--were established within the College, one in biology,[201] and the other being the already noted program in Hispanic Studies established in 1926. Nonetheless, enrollment in the college remained relatively small, and for the most part, it remained concentrated in the first two years.[202] Moreover, while relatively strong in the natural sciences,

the college was particularly weak in philosophy and the social sciences, that is, the departments that traditionally have been the most politically sensitive and socially critical components of the liberal arts, or what the Teachers College's Commission regarded as the University departments "which ought to deal in a large way with the great social and economic problems of the Island."[203] Interestingly enough, the Commission also remarked, in the same page of their report, that the relatively small enrollment of this college reflected the lack of interest of Puerto Rico's youth in non-professional higher education, a remark that in a sense was partially confirmed by the fact that along with its non-specialized program in "arts and sciences", the College of Liberal Arts offered a pre-professional training program in law and medicine, which accounted for nearly 30 percent of the College enrollment (see Table 13). On the other hand, it should be considered that even the non-specialized Liberal Arts program served many students, not only as a preparatory training for more specialized graduate programs, but also as a directly useful, and perhaps sufficient academic preparation for entering into many of the growing clerical and white collar (including teaching) occupations of the insular job market.

It is worth observing in this context that many of the

TABLE 13

Enrollment at the University of Puerto Rico, by Colleges, Programs, and Gender, for the Year 1930-31

	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
College of Arts and Sciences:			
Four-year course	94	83	177
Pre-Medical	16	1	17
Pre-Legal	44	9	53
College of Education:			
Four-year course	69	231	300
Home Economics		99	99
Normal	29	211	240
Rural	10	31	41
College of Law	62	2	64
College of Pharmacy	17	18	35
College of Business Administration:			
Business Administration	71	5	76
Secretarial	13	75	88
College of Agriculture and Mechanical Arts:			
Agriculture	140		140
Engineering	153		153
General Science		2	2
Specials	3	5	8
Department of Spanish Studies	1	9	10
Extension:			
Accounting	63	1	64
Business Administration	54	4	58
Secretarial	16	31	47
Unclassified	12	13	25
Summer Session	279	611	890
Total University Enrollment	1,146	1,441	2,587

Source: Osuna (1949-538-539)

limitations of the College of Liberal Arts as well as the strong vocational professional orientation of the University were particularly evident in the College of Education. It should be mentioned at the onset that if for the most part of the period covered in this Chapter the University as a whole functioned primarily as a two-year junior college level; the College of Education on the other hand, operated principally at a sub-collegiate level, for most of the students which it admitted since 1903 and through at least 1925,were still at the high school level. Though entrance requirements to the College of Education increased since 1903, still, by 1925, the overwhelming majority of its students were enrolled in an one year training course for rural teachers which required only completion of the tenth grade for admission.[204] Most of the rest of the students enrolled in the college during this period were concentrated in the two-year normal course which prepared them to teach in urban elementary schools, this again a kind of academic vocational work at the junior college level. Conversely, previous to 1925, the enrollment of students in the four-year course leading to a B.A. in Education remained very low. Although also certainly vocational in character--geared mainly for the preparation of high school teachers and principals--, its curriculum was somewhat broader in focus than those of the just mentioned one-

year rural and two-year normal program in that it included a large component of liberal art courses, though one should remember the previously described limitations of these courses.[205]

After 1925, entrance requirements to the rural one year course were raised significantly and by 1928 high school completion was required for admission, an increase which led very shortly to the incorporation of this course in the two-year normal program. As a result, enrollment in this latter program began to increase considerably, and so did the enrollments in the four-year B.A. course.[206]

Regarding the rise in the entrance requirements to the College of Education, it is worth noting not only that they were also being raised in the other colleges of the University, but that all of this was taking place at a time when high unemployment rates were already affecting the professional sectors of the Island (including teachers), a situation which put much pressure on all professional groups to place greater restrictions on the access to their occupations.[207] Not surprisingly, this situation worsened considerably with the 1929 Depression, and thus one finds that the unemployment rates for the graduates of the University were 43.8 percent in 1929 and 55.6 percent in 1931.[208] Interestingly enough, since its foundation in

1911, Puerto Rico's Teachers Association had been continuously pressuring the Department of Education to raise the academic training requirements to enter the teaching profession, but given the continuous shortage of teachers up to the early 1920s, the Commissioner of Education maintained very low requirements--generally lower than those required for entering the College of Education--, and even though the requirements for teacher's qualifications rose through the 1920s, before 1931, when a new certification law was enacted, it was still possible to qualify for teaching by passing an examination in subjects commonly included in the curriculum of the seventh grade.[209] The 1931 certification law considerably raised the academic training requirements for entering the teaching profession, requiring at least graduation of the two year normal course for teaching in all (both urban and rural) schools.[210] As can be seen, the new academic training standards of this law were very consistent with the late 1920s trends in rising admission requirements at the University's College of Education, and in both cases they were justified by officials and teachers as means of raising the levels of competency of the teaching personnel. But whether or not this was in fact accomplished, the truth is that the rising requirements in academic preparation not only made the selection of new teachers from among the mass of unemployed

aspirants to the teaching profession easier, but also delayed the entrance of qualified ones to the job market by extending the period of their training.

Incidentally, something similar could be said about the 1926 establishment of the School of Business Administration at the University. Curiously, the already mentioned Teachers College's Commission had warned that the "education of a large number of young people for 'white collar jobs' which do not exist, results in the development of a class of the socially discontented," and had argued against the extension of commercial education in high schools on the basis that commercial enterprises employed at the time only a very small percentage of the population.[211] In this circumstance, the establishment of secretarial and business training at the University level appears as one more instance of "educational inflation" in which the upgrading of educational qualifications for jobs which until then were performed by people with high school preparation or less, had the effect of delaying the entrance of new competitors into an already crowded job market.

The question remains if this manner of alleviating the pressures on the job market also prevented the rise of a "class of the socially discontented". The answers seem

to be negative, for what happened with the expansion of the school system and specifically with the expansion of the secondary and university education was the formation, particularly during the Great Depression, of a highly schooled unemployed population, including a large sector of unemployed professionals, greatly dissapointed with what the colonial social order had to offer them. And in fact, it was the professional and intellectual strata, including many university students, that increasingly came to share such a dissapointment, especially as they faced their dim employment prospects, the ones that would lead the great movements of social reform and protest against U.S. imperialism that were to emerge in the 1930s.[212] But this of course falls beyond the time delimitations of this study.

A few words are in order regarding the participation of women and non-whites in the University. Unfortunately, there is little information about the participation of colored people in the University and the author could not find any statistical breakdown of the enrollment of whites and non-whites there. However some indirect indication of the level of attendance of non-whites at the University are provided by the census data for the years 1910, 1920 and 1930, which show that the school attendance rates for the non-white population of 18 to 20 years old was,

percentage-wise, 4.3, 8.1 and 3.8 respectively, while for whites it was 5.3, 10.4 and 5.6 respectively for those same years.[213] Though these figures do not refer precisely to attendance at the University or any other post-secondary education, they show, nevertheless, that non-whites had a slightly lower attendance rate than whites at the age levels more closely associated with university education, and that the gap became slightly larger in 1930, showing apparently that the 1929 Depression had a greater toll on the attendance level of non-whites than whites. It is very likely, however, that the actual attendance rates of non-whites at the University was much lower than whites, and that once in the University, non-whites had to face the racial predjudice prevalent in the insular society, and particularly evident, as noted in the previous section, among North American residents in the Island and the insular white elite; for it was these two groups who monopolized the administration and faculty of the University, (in 1925, the faculty was constituted by 42 North Americans and 32 Puerto Ricans).[214] On the other hand there is evidence of a high degree of racist attitudes of the university student body during that time.[215] Moreover, as also mentioned before, once graduated from the University, the few non-whites who did so, faced racial discrimination in their respective professional fields and public life.

There is neither much statistical data on the attendance of women to the University of Puerto Rico before 1930, but the little there is available gives a clearer picture of their presence there. The census data for the years 1910, 1920 and 1930 show that women were slightly behind men in school attendance rate for the 18 to 20 year old population: percentage wise 3.8, 8.8 and 4.4 respectively for women, and 5.3, 11.0 and 5.9 for men.[216] It may be, however, that the actual attendance of women to the University was greater for women than men. In fact, of the 2,791 students who graduated from the University between 1903 and 1923, 74 percent were women, a phenomenon in great part attributed to the fact that women constituted throughout all this period the overwhelming majority of the student body of the College of Education,[217] which was, as noted before, the oldest and largest (in terms of enrollment) department of the University. University enrollment for the years 1930-1931, as shown in Table 13, also shows a larger number of women than men (1441 women and 1146 men). In all, the available statistics show that women had wide access to insular university studies and that at least in some instances, their enrollment and/or graduation rates were greater than men. However, as in the case of their pre-collegial education, their type of University education was greatly sex-gender differentiated

along patriarchal lines. This can be seen both in the 1903-1923 graduate data just mentioned, as well as in the enrollment figures for 1930-31 (see Table 13), which indicate that most women who were enrolled in and graduated from these programs were training for the traditionally female and comparatively low paying careers of elementary school or home economics, teaching and secretarial work, while men were concentrated in those programs training for the high status, higher paying professions of law, engineering and agronomy. But it must be kept in mind, that such patriarchal incorporation in the University and, beyond that, into the professions, was not without its own contradictions, for as was noted in the preceding two sections of this Chapter, it also facilitated the increased participation of women--in this case women from the middle and upper classes--in public life as was particularly evident in the insular suffragist movement.

Before ending this Chapter, a few words should be said regarding the development of private schools between 1900-1930. In general, the growth in the number of private schools was relatively slow during this period and by 1929-30, enrollment in private accredited schools amounted to only 5,728 students (375 in kindergartens, 4,421 in primary

schools, and 932 in secondary schools), that is, 2.6 percent of the total enrollment (221,189) in public primary and secondary schools.[218] There were also some non-accredited private schools of various types (48 were reported in 1930-31,[219] no figures were given however regarding their student enrollment and in general very little is known of these schools); at any rate, the fact that these schools were not accredited by the Department of Education greatly undermined the socially recognized value of their educational offerings and credentials. This by the way, was a clear indication that even in the case of private schools, the colonial government, by means of the Department of Education, was the ultimate authority in the Island regarding educational matters. In other words, if private schools wanted to be accredited, they had to meet the requirements set by the Department of Education regarding course of study, preparation of teachers, textbooks, organization, buildings, etc., and while they could teach courses not in the official course of study, these could not interfere with the latter.[220]

One interesting aspect of the development of private schools during this period, was the role played by the Catholic and Protestant churches. As was indicated in Chapter IV, one of the first measures of the U.S. military authorities in 1898 was to decree the separation of Church

and State, a measure which not merely cut government subsidies to the Catholic Church and drastically reduced the latter's power over public education, but also opened the way for the influx to the Island of U.S. Protestant missionaries of various denominations who, with the strong encouragement of the colonial authorities, did a significant job in spreading Protestantism among the insular population, particularly among the rural and urban proletariat. But despite their extensive missionary work, the Protestant churches did not put much effort in the establishment of private schools, and on the whole they were strong supporters of the "American" public school system that was being established on the Island.[221] And thus, as late as 1940-41, there were only 5 private schools under the auspices of Protestant churches, and this out of a total of 49 private schools.[222]

Perhaps the most well-known of the Protestant schools was the Polytechnic Institute at San German, established by a Presbyterian missionary in 1912. It began as an elementary school, but soon it developed a high school curriculum, and by 1921 it began to offer a post-secondary program in liberal arts, though the latter was slow to develop and not until 1927 did it have the first college graduation (only 23 students).[223] During all this period, the Polytechnic Institute tried to offer a curriculum that

combined academic work with vocational and technical training (hence its name), with the professed aim of producing "American citizens of trained minds, sound bodies, well rounded vigorous character, resourceful, independent and of sturdy Christian faith."[224] In 1927 the Institute discontinued its elementary school and in 1933 it would do the same with the high school, thus becoming exclusively a post-secondary institution.[225]

Another post-secondary institution established during this period under Protestant auspices was the Evangelical Seminary of Puerto Rico. The Seminary, which opened in 1919, was founded and controlled jointly by five Protestant denominations and had as its main purpose, the training of the ministry of these churches. As such, it should be noted, it served as a training center not only for Puerto Rico but for the whole Caribbean area.[226]

If in general, the activity of the Protestant churches in the creation of private schools was rather limited, their missionary work on the Island was extensive enough to cause an understandable degree of alarm in the Catholic hierarchy, whose situation was already gravely critical, given the measures taken by the U.S. colonial authorities toward the secularization of the state and of public education. As suggested above, this meant concretely that

the Catholic Church would no longer enjoy either the financial support from the government, or share the latter's control over public education as it did during the Spanish regime. Moreover, these measures and the general circumstances of the change from Spanish to U.S. rule, led to the return of many Spanish priests and nuns to Spain and to the closing of various of their schools. Slowly, however, the Church recuperated, reorganizing its hierarchy with U.S. bishops, replenishing its religious personnel with mostly U.S. priests and nuns, and establishing--particularly after 1917--a network of private schools, a recuperation greatly reinforced by the Church's determination of facing the challenge of Protestantism and of the secularization tendencies of the State.[227] In the end, and in spite of the great advances of the Protestant denominations, the Catholic Church was able to maintain its religious hegemony over the Island, and while no longer a controlling influence in public education, it clearly dominated in the area of private education during the period of concern here and would do so to the present time. And thus, for instance, of the 49 accredited private schools that were recorded for 1940-41, 38 were under the auspices of the Catholic Church.[228]

Two aspects of the development of Catholic private schools are worth considering here. The first is that to

a large extent the Catholic schools were as much embarked in the process of "Americanization" as were the public schools and the few Protestant ones. Though "Americanization" was not perhaps the main educational concern of the Catholic hierarchy and teachers, as was for instance in the case of the Commissioners of Education, their educational work nevertheless moved clearly in that direction, partly because most of them were North Americans and partly because in order to get accreditation from the government they had to follow the official program of studies of the Department of Education, with its strong "Americanizing" content and its English language policies.[229] It is thus an irony that at the same time that a large sector of the pro-independence, nationalist and autonomist forces of the insular elites were making Catholicism a patriotic symbol of the Hispanic tradition of the Puerto Rican culture, the Catholic Church and its schools were becoming another instrument of "Americanization" in the Island.

The other aspect worth considering here regarding the development of Catholic private schools was their tendency to become increasingly, schools for the middle and upper classes. Despite the initial intentions and efforts of the North American bishops, clergy and nuns to do

educational work with the poor, working classes of the Island--mainly by means of parochial primary schools with free tuition--gradually they became more concerned with the establishment of tuition-paying schools almost exclusively accessible to the more wealthy classes.[230] During the period of interest here, this trend was favored by the fact that the Church had limited financial resources and got little community support for their parochial schools, a situation which pressed the former to rely increasingly on students who could pay their tuitions. But it should be noted here, as a way of ending this Chapter, that this trend would become even stonger after 1930, and more so after 1948, when Catholic schools would specifically cater to the wealthy classes of the Island who were eager to preserve a high status and "American" form of education for their children, especially at a time when public high schools were becoming accessible to the masses and when Spanish was finally decreed as the language of instruction in public schools.[231]

FOOTNOTES

[1]On the 1900 Foraker Act, see Gould (1969), Hunter (1966), Luque de Sánchez (1980), Rafucci de García (1981), Ramos de Santiago (1970b), and Trías Monge (1980). The Act is included in Ramos de Santiago (1970a).

[2]Trías Monge (1980:288-289).

[3]Trías Monge (1980:279), Quintero Rivera (1976:87).

[4]Clark (1930:50-51). On the conservative and limited character of this legislation, see Trías Monge (1980:288).

[5]Luque de Sánchez (1980:125,181-187), Trías Monge (1980:225-226).

[6]On the insular cases, see Gould (1969:145-167) and Trías Monge (1980:235-272).

[7]Luque de Sánchez (1980:127), Trías Monge (1980:281, 297-298).

[8]Clark (1973:225-226; 1975:11-12), Trías Monge (1980: 281).

[9]Luque de Sánchez (1980:145-147), Trías Monge (1980: 298).

[10]Hunter (1966:67-72), Trías Monge (1981:20-25).

[11]Clark (1975:21), Trías Monge (1981:40-41).

[12]On the political process leading to the enactment of the 1917 Jones Act, see Clark (1975:22-24), Hunter (1966: 72-76), and especially, Trías Monge (1981:25-88).

[13]An extensive analysis of the Jones Act is provided by Trías Monge (1981:88-110); see also Clark (1975:24-28), Ramos de Santiago (1970b). The complete text of the Act is included in Ramos de Santiago (1970a).

[14]Clark (1975:23-24), Negrón de Montilla (1970:161-162).

[15]Ramos de Santiago (1970b:82).

[16]Clark (1975:172-173).

[17]For overviews of the history of party politics in Puerto Rico during this period, see Bothwell (1979, Vol.I-I:27-37), Quintero Rivera (1976b), Pagán (1959, Vol.1), Ramos de Santiago (1970b), Trías Monge (1980:272-277); 1981: 8-39,56-65,11-139).

[18]On the changing social composition of the Republican Party during this period, see Quintero Rivera (1976b:58-69), Ramos (1980:259-261).

[19]Díaz Soler (1960, Vol.I:203-292), Quintero Rivera (1976b:60-61).

[20]Quintero Rivera (1975:56), Negrón Portillo (1981:52-53,56-58), Trías Monge (1980:274). Bothwell (1979, Vol.I-I:26-27) argues that while Republicans were more responsible for the "turbas" in San Juan, the Federalists also were in some towns of the Island.

[21]Luque de Sánchez (1980:137-138,141-143,163-166), Negrón Portillo (1981:59-65), Rafucci de García (1981:126-131).

[22]Hunter (1966:67), Trías Monge (1981:8-13).

[23]Hunter (1966:67), Negrón Portillo (1981:68-95), Quintero Rivera (1976b:49-51), Trías Monge (1981:25-39).

[24]Negrón de Montilla (1970:133-141), García de Serrano (1971:114-118).

[25]Negrón Portillo (1981:78-79).

[26]These influences are particularly evident in the political thought and development of Matienzo Cintrón. On Matienzo Cintrón, see Díaz Soler (1960); also Mattos Cintrón (1980:68-69), Quintero Rivera (1975:81-83).

[27]Mattos Cintrón (1980:69), Quintero Rivera (1975:81), Trías Monge (1981:38-39).

[28]Mattos Cintrón (1980:68), Trías Monge (1981:55).

[29]Clark (1975:48-82), Quintero Rivera (1975:87-88).

[30]On the Nationalist Party, see Christopulos (1974:138-140), Mattos Cintrón (1980:85-88).

[31]On the Alianza, see Trías Monge (1981:111-115,128-139).

[32]Negrón de Montilla (1970:175-234), Picó (1974b:187-192), Quintero Rivera (1980:79-81).

[33]On the FLT and the Socialist Party, see Galvin (1976: 17-31), García and Quintero Rivera (1982:35-105), Knowles (1966:316-319), Mattos Cintrón (1980:60-66), Quintero Rivera (1975, 1976a, 1976c), Silén (1978:57-88), Silvestrini de Pacheco (1979:13-24).

[34]Quintero Rivera (1976c:64,108-109); also García and Quintero Rivera (1982:82), Picó de Hernández (1974b:191).

[35]The 1919, 1923, 1928 and 1932 political platforms of the Socialist Party are included in Bothwell (1979, Vol. I-I).

[36]Bothwell (1979, Vol.I-I:454-455).

[37]See, for instance, Bothwell (1979, Vol.I-I:454-457).

[38]Bothwell (1979, Vol.I-I:457-458).

[39]García and Quintero Rivera (1982:77-78).

[40]García and Quintero Rivera (1982:82-83).

[41]García and Quintero Rivera (1982:102).

[42]García and Quintero Rivera (1982:102-103).

[43]Silvestrini de Pacheco (1979:24).

[44]García and Pacheco Rivera (1982:105-106), Silvestrini de Pacheco (1979:24,147-148).

[45]García and Quintero Rivera (1982:75-78), Picó (1980: 30-32), Silvestrini de Pacheco (1980:73-74), Valle (1980: 94-96).

[46]On the Puerto Rican woman suffragist movement, see Clark (1975:40-46), Picó de Hernández (1980:39-40), Valle (1980:93-97).

[47]Clark (1975:42), Valle (1980:93).

[48]Picó de Hernández (1979:39), Rivera Quintero (1979: 21).

[49]Picó de Hernández (1979:36).

[50]Mathews (1974:316-317).

[51]Mathews (1974:317-319), Mintz (1966:405-408).

[52]Mathews (1974:308-309).

[53]Mathews (1974:305).

[54]Clark (1973:222-223, 1975:13).

[55]House Speaker Common also speaks of the "ennervating effects" of living in the tropics; while Samuel McCune Lidsay, shortly after he resigned as second Commissioner of Education of the Island under the civil government--and of whom more will be said below--will speak of the inferiority of the Puerto Ricans in terms of the "special character" and "peculiar difficulties" of the Puerto Rican people given their Latin American background. See Clark (1973:222-223; 1975:13-14).

[56]Clark (1973:223-224).

[57]Mathews (1974:305-309), Rosario and Carrión (1939: 134-140,144-158).

[58]On the issue of free trade between the U.S. and Puerto Rico, and on the application of 15 percent of the Dingley Tariff to the Island, see Gould (1969:67-118), Luque de Sánchez (1980:85-88,104-107,109-125,128-133,162-173), Rafucci de García (1981:62-89).

[59]Actually, more helpful in this regard than the application of the 15 percent of the Dingley Tariff was the return to the insular treasury of the revenues collected by the U.S. federal government during the military regime in the form of custom tariffs on products from the Island entering the U.S.; thus these revenues amounted to $2,102,938, while the 15 percent Dingley Tariff generated only $611,310 while it was in effect. See Gould (1969: 117). On the funds assigned to school buildings from these amounts, see Osuna (1949:188-190).

[60]Osuna (1949:188-189), Trías Monge (1980:226).

[61]Luque de Sánchez (1980:147-151).

[62]Quintero Rivera (1974a:109); see also Bergad (1978: 74).

[63]Bergad (1978:75-76), Quintero Rivera (1974a:106-107).

[64]Picó (1981a:36-37).

[65]Picó (1981a:39).

[66]Picó (1981a:40).

[67]Bergad (1978:74-83), Quintero Rivera (1974a:105-110).

[68]Quintero Rivera (1976b:63-65).

[69]Bergad (1978:79,82), Quintero Rivera (1976b:124).

[70]Bergad (1978:74).

[71]Bergad (1978:83-85). Clark et al (1930:404).

[72]Clark (1975:17,24).

[73]Diffie (1931:52).

[74]Diffie (1931:81-82).

[75]Clark (1975:96-97), Diffie (1931:84-85).

[76]Bergad (1978:79-80), Quintero Rivera (1974a:107), Steward et al (1956:72).

[77]Bergad (1978:82-83).

[78]Bergad (1978:79-80), Clark et al (1930:613-626).

[79]Bergad (1978:79-80).

[80]Clark (1975:120).

[81]Bergad (1978:76), Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños (1979:103-108), García and Quintero Rivera (1982:93-98), Quintero Rivera (1974c:66-75).

[82]Quintero Rivera (1974c:70).

[83]Quintero Rivera (1974c:101).

[84]Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños (1979:108-112).

[85]Quintero Rivera (1975:268-270), Steward et al (1956: 354).

[86]Quintero Rivera (1975:269).

[87]Diffie (1931:166).

[88]Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños (1979:110-111), Quintero Rivera (1975:267).

[89]Bergad (1978:80). For fuller descriptions of the sugar cane proletariat, Quintero Rivera (1974b:82-96) and the section written by S. Mintz in Steward et al (1956).

[90]García and Quintero Rivera (1982:67-71).

[91]García and Quintero Rivera (1982:95-98).

[92]Diffie (1931:85-86), Quintero Rivera (1975:264-265), Steward et al (1956:70).

[93]Clark et al (1930:23-24,34-35), Clark (1975:109-110), Steward et al (1956:352-354).

[94]Bergad (1978:86), Clark (1975:16-17).

[95]Clark et al (1930:636-639).

[96]Steward et al (1956:353-354).

[97]Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños (1979:99), Quintero Rivera (1975:270).

[98]Quintero Rivera (1978:127).

[99]Quintero Rivera (1978:125-132).

[100]Quintero Rivera (1978:131-132).

[101]U.S. War Department (1900a), U.S. Bureau of the Census (1910,1920,1930).

[102]Rivera Quintero (1979:15).

[103]García and Quintero Rivera (1982:71-78).

[104]Quintero Rivera (1978:135).

[105]U.S. Bureau of the Census (1930).

[106]Rivera Quintero (1979:15-16).

[107]Clark et al (1930:454)

[108]Osuna (1949:628).

[109]Quintero Rivera (1980:46).

[110]Clark et al (1930:169-170).

[111]Clark (1975:96-97), the International Institute of Teachers' College (1926:48).

[112]Clark et al (1930:145-146).

[113]Perloff (1950:27).

[114]Perloff (1950:27).

[115]See, for instance, Bothwell (1979, Vol.I-I).

[116]International Institute of Teachers' College (1926:30).

[117]Picó de Hernández (1974b:176-177), Quintero Rivera (1976b:130).

[118]Percentages calculated from Table 8.

[119]International Institute of Teachers' College (1926:311), U.S. War Department (1902:257).

[120]See Rosario and Carrión (1939:134-140,144-158), and U.S. Bureau of the Census (1930:Table 11).

[121]Clark et al (1930:339-340).

[122]García de Serrano (1969:5-13).

[123]García de Serrano (1969:9).

[124]García de Serrano (1971:124-145).

[125]Osuna (1949:140).

[126]Osuna (1949:140,266-268); for a more recent view, see Comisión Sobre Reforma Educativa (1977:43-45).

[127]García de Serrano (1971:23), Osuna (1949:150).

[128]Osuna (1949:149-150).

[129]International Institute of Teachers' College (1926: 347-357), Osuna (1949:143-149,273-275).

[130]Osuna (1949:273).

[131]International Institute of Teachers' College (1926: 323-336).

[132]Negrón de Montilla (1970:69).

[133]Negrón de Montilla (1970:203).

[134]Osuna (1949:527-528).

[135]Negrón de Montilla (1970:203).

[136]Negrón de Montilla (1970:27), Osuna (1949:139).

[137]Negrón de Montilla (1970:154).

[138]Ramos de Santiago (1970b:138).

[139]Fife and Manuel (1976:124-135), Mathews (1970:274-275).

[140]Negrón de Montilla (1970:181).

[141]Negrón de Montilla (1970:175-234).

[142]Negrón de Montilla (1970). Osuna (1949) and Picó de Hernández (1971, 1974a, 1974b) are also very useful in this respect. The problems and limitations of these works were examined in Chapter I of this study.

[143]U.S. War Department (1902:255).

[144]Lindsay (1903:78).

[145]U.S. House of Representatives (1901:216,238).

[146]Clark et al (1930:81).

[147]International Institute of Teachers' College (1926: 179), Rodríguez Bou (1966:165).

[148]The following account of the English language policies of the U.S. educational officials in Puerto Rico and the problems encountered by them, is based on Cebollero (1945), Fife and Manuel (1976), Negrón de Montilla (1970), Osuna (1949), Rodríguez Bou (1966).

[149]Negrón de Montilla (1970:118); see also Osuna (1949: 346-347).

[150]Negrón de Montilla (1970:134-140).

[151]Negrón de Montilla (1970:133).

[152]International Institute of Teachers' College (1926: 154-159), Osuna (1949:348-350).

[153]Negrón de Montilla (1970:192).

[154]Negrón de Montilla (1970:183-184).

[155]Negrón de Montilla (1970:164-234).

[156]Negrón de Montilla (1970:170-173,198-230), Picó de Hernández (1974a:Chapters IV and V, 1974b).

[157]Picó de Hernández (1974a:Chapters IV and V, 1974b).

[158]Negrón de Montilla (1970:171,197).

[159]Picó de Hernández (1974b:185-186).

[160]Incidentally, a measure which responded to the increasing antagonism of Huyke, a former Unionist, and the leadership of the Union Party in the legislature. See Chapter IX of Negrón de Montilla (1970).

[161]Picó de Hernández (1974b:186).

[162]Clark et al (1930:82), International Institute of Teachers' College (1926:172-174).

[163]U.S. Bureau of the Census (1910,1920,1930).

[164]International Institute of Teachers' College (1926: 153), Sussman (1972:322).

[165]Reid (1941:259).

[166]Lindsay (1903:78).

[167]Clark et al (1930:86-87).

[168]Picó de Hernández (1974a:80-81).

[169]U.S. War Department (1930a, 1930b).

[170]International Institute of Teachers' College (1926: 30).

[171]International Institute of Teachers' College (1926: 315-316), Osuna (1949:185-290).

[173]Lindsay (1903:78).

[174]Pedreira (1969).

[175]A recent expression of this view is found in Picó de Hernández (1974a:85).

[176]Clark et al (1930:82-83), International Institute of Teachers' College (1926), especially Chapters IV and V.

[177]U.S. War Department (1902:240).

[178]Osuna (1949:235-236), U.S. War Department (1902:240-241).

[179]International Institute of Teachers' College (1926: 252-253), U.S. War Department (1902:245-246).

[180]International Institute of Teachers' College (1926: 253), U.S. War Department (1907:410-411); regarding the political controversy sorrounding the industrial schools, see also Díaz Soler (1960:377-379).

[181]U.S. War Department (1930a:387-388).

[182]International Institute of Teachers' College (1926: 255-262), Osuna (1949:225-234).

[183]International Institute of Teachers' College (1926: 261).

[184]Clark et al (1930:489:490), Osuna (1949:237-238).

[185]Clark et al (1930:490).

[186]U.S. War Department (1930b:105-107).

[187]U.S. War Department (1930b:105).

[188]Reid (1941:265-267), Rodríguez Bou (1966:264-265).

[189]International Institute of Teachers' College (1926: 262-263), Osuna (1949:248).

[190]U.S. War Department (1930b:104).

[191]Clark et al (1930:84-87).

[192]Osuna (1949:256-257).

[193]U.S. War Department (1930b:113).

[194]Chapter IX of International Institute of Teachers' College (1926).

[195]Osuna (1949:251-252).

[196]International Institute of Teachers' College (1926: 423).

[197]Picó de Hernández (1974a:146).

[198]Osuna (1949:251).

[199]Osuna (1949:253,527-534).

[200]Osuna (1949:252).

[201]Osuna (1949:537).

[202]International Institute of Teachers' College (1926: 420-421).

[203]International Institute of Teachers' College (1926: 439).

[204]International Institute of Teachers' College (1926: 421), Osuna (1949:160-161,297).

[205]International Institute of Teachers' College (1926: 421-422), Osuna (1949:162-163).

[206]Osuna (1949:306,320).

[207]See, for instance, Osuna (1949:322).

[208]Picó de Hernández (1974a:157).

[209]Reid (1941:277). On the selection and certification of teachers for the 1900-1930 period, see García de Serrano (1971:121-146).

[210]Osuna (1949:308-313), García de Serrano (1971:146-150).

[211]International Institute of Teachers' College (1926: 33,263).

[212]On this point, see Quintero Rivera (1980) and Chapter V of Picó de Hernández (1974a).

[213]U.S. Bureau of the Census (1940:19).

[214]International Institute of Teachers' College (1926: 425-426).

[215]Picó de Hernández (1974b:190).

[216]U.S. Bureau of the Census (1940:19).

[217]Picó de Hernández (1980:26).

[218]U.S. War Department (1930b:101,114).

[219]Osuna (1949:475).

[220]Osuna (1949:477).

[221]Colón Rosado (1981:143-144), Pantojas García (1974: 112-114).

[222]Osuna (1949:476).

[223]Osuna (1949:588-589).

[224]Osuna (1949:590).

[225]Osuna (1949:590).

[226]Osuna (1949:594-595).

[227]See Colón Rosado (1981:27-34,40,142-151).

[228]Osuna (1949:476).

[229]Colón Rosado (1981:72-75,151-152).

[230]Colón Rosado (1981:76,329).

[231]On the class-segregated school system that resulted from this process, see Nieves Falcón (1965) and Sussman (1965,1972).

C H A P T E R V I

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study has sought to examine the interrelationships in Puerto Rico between the formal educational system and the political and economic spheres from the beginning of Spanish colonization up through the first three decades of U.S. colonial rule, that is, from 1508 to 1930. It has focused on the ways in which the power and privilege configurations or forms of domination which prevailed on the Island during that period or parts of that period--most particularly colonialism, Catholicism, racism, patriarchy, capitalism, bureaucracy and liberal democracy--shaped and were shaped by the development of the insular school system.

As explained in Chapter I, this study employs a socio-historical approach which assumes that power configurations or forms of domination are among the most important conditioning factors of human actions and institutions, and hence, important variables in determining the form and content of social outcomes as well as the distribution of wealth, prestige and knowledge in society. Another central assumption of this study is that while the various configurations of power in society might be intertwined

in varying degrees with each other, they might also be characterized by their distinctive dynamics, principles of legitimation and forms of social stratification, and might even conflict in differing measures with each other. In short, the diverse configuration of power or forms of domination in society might have different impacts in human action and institutions, and hence, upon educational developments. As suggested in Chapter I, in allowing for a clearer identification of the various forms of domination in society, such socio-historical approach may allow at the same time a better understanding of the social forces and structures that have limited or facilitated the development of personal autonomy and democratic interactions in all spheres of social life, including those spheres specialized to some degree or other in formal education.

As seen in Chapter II, the process of Spanish conquest, colonization, exploitation and decimation of large portions of the Americas in the 16th century, while catastrophic for the indigenous people of those regions, provided the source of vast power, wealth and missionary accomplishments to the Spanish Crown, the Catholic Church, the conquistadors and settlers, as well as the conditions for the emergence of a mercantile-capitalist world-economy that ironically would benefit other Western European countries more than the predominantly feudal Spain. At the same time,

this process provided the impetus and resources for the establishment in both Spain and several other richer American colonies of a significant number of universities, university colleges and seminaries which served their upper classes as training centers not only for the Catholic clergy and the classical liberal professions (law and medicine), but also, as in the particular instance of those located in Spain, of the expanding and increasingly centralized imperial State bureaucracy.

However, developments in Puerto Rico were quite different, and this, despite the fact that the Island was among the first to be colonized by the Spaniards, to be incorporated through feudal or non-capitalist institutions into a nascent mercantile capitalist world-economy, to have produced through the forced labor of the subjugated indigenous population and imported African slaves a gold bonanza for Spain and its colonists, and indeed, in spite of being among the first to establish during its gold bonanza phase (from 1508 to the 1530s) Catholic institutions--namely the cathedral and Dominican convent of San Juan--offering or planning to offer, among other things, some type of formal education. In spite of these auspicious beginnings, the colonial project subsequently and until the second half of the 18th century, generally stagnated economically, politically and ecclesiastically, as well as educationally.

Irrespective of their exploitative and civilizing intentions, the Spaniards quickly decimated the insular indigenous population, the Taínos, who were initially their main source of cheap labor and the prime target, as formally "free" souls and subjects of the Crown, of their missionary activities--an honor which however dubious was not accorded to the African slaves brought to replace the dissappearing Taínos. The Spaniards, moreover, quickly depleted the insular gold resources, and after some feeble attempts in developing the Island as a profitable, agricultural colony, producing export-staples (sugar and cattle hides) for Spain on the basis of black slave labor, lost much of their economic interest in the Island; in part because they were now more interested in exploiting the silver riches of Mexico and Peru, but also because Spain was unable, given its draining and weakening involvement in the imperial and Counter Reformation wars in Europe and its subsequent political, military and economic decline as a world power, to provide the adequate conditions (i.e. transport, capital, cheap or slave labor) for developing an attractive profitable economy in the Island for its settlers.

To be sure, while since the 1530s to until the second half of the 18th century, Puerto Rico lost much of its economic value for Spain, it gained considerable military strategic importance, especially as the French, Dutch and

English began to penetrate the Caribbean and threatened to interrupt and paralyze the fleets transporting the silver treasures from continental America to Spain. This situation led Spain to hold firmly to Puerto Rico and gradually improve its defenses, a project which consisted basically on turning the small port-town of San Juan--the Island's major settlement and its administrative, military, ecclesiastical center--into a formidable, fortified military bastion. But this project, along with the small bureaucratic, military and ecclesiastical contingents which were maintained on the Island, had to be subsidized from external sources (mainly, by the so-called "Mexican situado") for the colony's poor economy generated considerably less revenues than the ones required to cover the costs for even such small bureaucratic, military and ecclesiastical groupings, and their rather limited operations in Puerto Rico--including in this respect the religious and educational activities of the Church. As it turned out, these small colonial contingents, the improved fortifications and the small population of the Island proved strong and fortunate enough for the defense of the colony against the several attacks made during this period by French, Dutch and English corsairs and naval expeditions. But, aside from that, the political-military, ecclesiastical, and commercial developments that accompanied the

increasing military importance of the Island were not merely rather rudimentary in character but also largely limited to San Juan, with little impact in fact beyond the walls of this fortress-town.

Outside of the walls of San Juan, much of the population lived sparsely and isolated in the fertile interior and coastal lands of the Island, and dedicated for the most part to subsistence farming. There was some increase in the production of commodities for exportation, but a significant portion of such production found its way out through the contraband trade that flourished during this period between the settlers and French, Dutch, English and North American traders, a development which along with the subsistence character of much of the farming, limited the internal commerce of the Island and the generation of revenues for the colonial government and the Church. On the other hand, while some of the rural production for export was done in large farms or cattle ranches worked by black slaves and free-wage laborers, such land estates remained few in number, and their owners had much difficulty in finding cheap labor, whether "free" or slave. Moreover, during this period the slave population of the Island grew very slowly, in fact not only at a much lower rate than the free white population which also grew very slowly, but also of the free, non-white (black and non-white)

population which constituted a large portion of the overall free population. In short, throughout this period, though Puerto Rico remained a patriarchal, racist society, inserted in a recessionary mercantile world-economy, and nominally Catholic and loyal to the Crown, most of the Islanders, both white and non-white, and particularly those outside of San Juan, were to a great extent, beyond the control of large landowners, urban merchants and the colonial administrative, military and ecclesiastical institutions, and therefore, outside of the reach of the evangelical and educational activities of the latter or, for that matter, of any other institution.

It is not surprising then that in such colonial circumstances there was scarcely any development in formal education. Even San Juan, with its auspicious educational beginnings in the establishment of the cathedral and the Dominican convent, had little progress in that respect and thus by the middle of the 18th century one finds in the whole Island that the only other institution, aside from the above two that might have been offering some formal education was the Franciscan convent, founded also in San Juan during the 17th century. Though geared chiefly for the training of the clergy and to a lesser extent, for providing preparatory instruction for university education and the classical liberal professions, it appears that the

educational offerings of those institutions was discontinuous in time and available to only a few of the sons of the upper classes. It seems, in addition, that they never provided anything more than the rudiments of the Latin grammar, theology and scholastic liberal arts provided in the degree-granting colleges, seminaries and universities which sprung up during this period both in Spain and other Spanish-American colonies. Indeed, given the overall lack of revenues and accumulated wealth of the Island, neither were the Church nor the State nor the relatively poor higher classes capable of supporting such a type of education; and if this was true regarding the upper classes son's education in Puerto Rico, it was more so regarding their education overseas, where they had to go if they wished to have university and professional training, an opportunity which in fact only a few had and then with considerable hardships.

If during this period the equivalent of secondary and professional education was limited to those rudimentary offerings in the Cathedral and the Dominican and Franciscan convents it appears that what may be called primary education, that is, basic literacy training in the vernacular, did not amount to much more than what might have been offered in this regard in these same institutions or by a few private tutors to a few of the sons, again,

of the upper classes. But though this compares unfavorably with primary educational developments in both Spain and Spanish America, the differences in this respect were not substantial for nowhere in the Spanish dominions were the Crown, the Church, or the upper classes as interested in the spread of primary schooling to the masses as they were in the expansion of universities, seminaries and secondary colleges; and neither was there in these areas any popular demand for such form of education. In fact, one can even find instances where while there was some spontaneous growth of literacy learning, both the Crown and the Church attempted not only to secure control over this process but more crucially to check its growth, fearing that mass literacy could facilitate the spread of subversive and heretical ideas. Such concerns were of course consistent with the policy of rigorous Catholic orthodoxy which the Crown tried to enforce in all its domains and on all types of cultural diffussion, including formal education and the printed media; a policy which served incidentally not only to secure the exclusivity and purity of the Catholic faith, but also to strengthen the authority of the State over all sectors of the Spanish empire, and this applies to the Church, which in all domains was largely under the authority of the Crown and functioned to a great degree as its main ideological and legitimating agency. In any event, this

policy of Catholic orthodoxy could be hardly enforced in Puerto Rico outside of the walls of San Juan--except perhaps with respect to the circulation of subversive or heretical books, given the almost total illiteracy of the rural population and the inaccessibility of printed material to them--but at least this population remained nominally Catholic and loyal to the Crown, regardless of how unruly and carefree they were under the colonial and Church authorities.

This picture changed substantially in the last century and a half of Spanish colonial rule in Puerto Rico, as seen in Chapter III. During the 18th century, the Spanish Bourbons marshalled Spain into a phase of political, economic and cultural reforms inspired chiefly by the absolutism, "enlightened depotism" and modern State-mercantilism of the French Bourbons, but also to some degree--consistent with such royal absolutism and State-mercantilism--by the nascent liberal bourgeois ideology of economic "laissez faire". To a considerable extent, the Bourbons succeeded in strengthening the centralized administrative, coercive (legal-military) and ideologized power of the Crown over all of Spain and its colonies, and in fostering the commercial economy of both these areas within a progressively modernized colonial mercantilistic framework designed to exploit the increased prosperity of

the latter to the benefit of the former.

A central aspect of the Bourbon reforms were the attempts to popularize in Spain the empirical, scientific and technical rationality of the European Enlightment, a form of rationality considered to be particularly useful for improving agricultural and industrial production and the administrative efficiency of the State apparatus. Interestingly, to popularize this type of "useful" rationality, the Bourbons made education a prime target of their political and economic reforms, increasingly intervening in the control of primary education and the training of primary school teachers, and making particular efforts in the creation of popular technical and craft schools and of special centers of scientific scholarship, as well as in replacing the traditional scholastic curricula of the universities and colleges with a more modern--though still Catholic--scientific one. These efforts were only partially successful, especially so regarding the attempts at revising the curricula of universities and colleges where the Bourbon reforms encountered the strong and growing opposition of the conservative clergy and monastic orders of the Church who controlled these institutions. Yet the Bourbon's efforts in this respect, along with such other measures as the expulsion of the Jesuits and their attempts to disentail

Church lands, marked the beginnings of a phase of State-Church conflicts that would continue through the 19th century and in which the power (cultural as well as political and economic) of the latter, though remaining still substantial, would be significantly weakened relative to the State apparatus and to the ascending rationalist secular forces.

Overall, the Bourbon reforms had a great though uneven impact over Puerto Rico. On the one hand, the Spanish State became increasingly more concerned, capable and successful not merely in improving considerably the military defenses of Puerto Rico, but also in promoting and benefitting from the commercial, export-oriented agriculture of the Island; in stimulating the growth of its free and slave population and of its urban concentrations; and in increasing, through an expanded colonial administrative and military apparatus, greater bureaucratic and coercive power over all sectors of the insular population including over its overwhelming rural majorities. On the other hand, while these developments provided the conditions for the increasing wealth and importance of a commercial and export-oriented landowning insular elite, by the end of the 18th century this group was still relatively small and politically weak--relative not only to the hegemonic Spanish-born colonial bureaucratic, military and merchant

sectors of the Island but also to their far stronger and richer creole counterparts in most of the other Spanish American colonies. Moreover, while the growing landed, merchant and bureaucratic elites would increase their demands for the establishment of secondary, university and professional schools in Puerto Rico, there was no significant development in this respect beyond the rudimentary and traditional Latin, theological and liberal arts courses offered at the cathedral and the Dominican and Franciscan convents. Yet the increasingly well off local elites were more able now to send their sons to pursue such studies to Spain and other Spanish American colonies, a situation which allowed not only for a small expansion of the insular professional and intellectual sectors but also for their increasing contact with the rationalist Enlightenment currents which flourished in the more developed cultural and educational institutions of those Spanish regions. On the other hand, though this period is also marked by a growing concern by both the colonial bureaucratic and ecclesiastical authorities in increasing their respective ideological control over the population, especially through the establishment of public primary schools, there was very little accomplished in this respect; and indeed by the end of the 18th century, literacy remained restricted to a very tiny minority of the urban population, a situation

reinforced by the scarcity of printed materials and by the fact that no printing press appeared on the Island until the beginning of the 19th century.

Notwithstanding its recovery as a national and colonial power during the 18th century, by the turn of the 19th century Spain had weakened considerably both politically and economically, and had become, for all practical purposes, a French satellite. During the first decade of the 19th century, a popular uprising that forced the abdication of the King was followed quickly by an invasion and occupation by revolutionary France, and this in turn provoked a popular war of liberation (1808-1814) against the French that would lead to the establishment of the first liberal constitutional government in Spain, and subsequently, as royal absolutism was restored in the peninsula, to the successful wars of independence of the Spanish colonies of continental America. By 1825 all that remained of the Spanish empire in America was Cuba and Puerto Rico. Meanwhile, between 1820 and 1823 Spain had another brief experience in liberal constitutional government; but again this regime was followed by another period of absolutist reaction, setting accordingly, amidst continuous and often violent socio-political struggles and regional conflicts, a wavering trend between more or less liberal and secularizing constitutional regimes and more or

less conservative, absolutist-Catholic ones, which would characterize Spanish history throughout the rest of the century. Yet, in spite of the advances of the liberal and even democratic forces in Spain during this period--advances that found their supreme expression in the revolutionary years between 1868-1874 which culminated in the establishment of the first but brief Spanish Republic--what emerged therein as a prevalent order was a highly centralized and elitist, patriarchal parliamentary monarchy, dominated by a conservative landowning and urban bourgeoisie, and a bureaucratic and military oligarchy. Moreover, with the consolidation of power of these sectors, the Catholic Church was able to re-establish its alliance with the State and through this, to regain a substantial degree of religious and educational authority in the peninsula, an authority that had been considerably weakened by the liberal regimes which had stripped the Church not only of much of its lands but also of much of its control over education. In all, it is possible that the struggle for the control of education in Spain between the liberal and religious-conservative forces provided some stimulus for the expansion of schooling during the 19th century, but such expansion was limited, and by the end of the century Spain still had one of the lowest literacy rates in Europe.

Although the socio-political turmoil and changes that afflicted Spain throughout the 19th century had a profound effect on Puerto Rico, the Island experienced for the most part of that century, relative peace. Not even the wars of independence of the continental Spanish-American colonies during the 1810s and 1820s did much to disturb such tranquility, though again they affected significantly subsequent developments in Puerto Rico. The insular creole elite welcomed and participated enthusiastically in the brief liberal constitutional experiments of the Spanish government, which extended to all the colonies the same constitutional rights and rights of representation in the central Spanish parliament as the rest of the provinces in the metropolis; but it was neither as strong nor as radical as their counterparts in Spanish America to follow their example in their wars of independence even when absolutism was restored in Spain. On the other hand, whatever the extent of the liberal component within the insular creole elite, its political weight was considerably weakened not only by the re-establishment of absolutism in Spain, but also by a series of measures and events--namely, the appointment of a series of despotic and arbitrary colonial rulers in Puerto Rico, the reinforcement therein of the Spanish military presence as a result of the continental wars of independence, and the immigration to

the Island of a large number of Spanish and French conservatives fleeing those and other colonial wars and conflicts --which had a profound influential effect on the insular population even during the succession of constitutional monarchic regimes (1833-1874) that replaced royal absolutism in Spain.

However, while these developments slowed the growth of political liberalism in Puerto Rico, the influx of these immigrants, many of thom were rich and experienced planters, enlarged and gave increasing strength to the insular export-oriented landed bourgeoisie, a process that would receive a more momentous stimulus with the enactment in 1815 of the celebrated Cédula de Gracias, which in addition to providing the immigration of Catholic planters and the importation of slaves and agricultural machinery, provided much greater freedom of trade between the Island and foreign countries. In all, the colonial convulsions of the beginning of the century and the implementations of the Cédula triggered not only a sharp rise of the Island's population, but also the rapid expansion of its commercial export agriculture, and with this, the growth in wealth and power of the insular landed bourgeoisie, and the increase of governmental revenues. At the same time, these developments provided for the establishment of a form of alliance between the landed bourgeoisie and the colonial apparatus

by which the former got the support of the latter's legal-coercive instruments in extending their control over larger extensions of lands and over a greater number of peasant laborers and black slaves. However, while commercial export agriculture continued to expand for the most part of the 19th century--or more properly, the sugar sector during the first half, and coffee during the second half--the increasingly larger and stronger landed bourgeoisie would grow even more frustrated, especially during the second half of the 19th century with the escalating mercantile tariffs and taxes imposed by the Spanish government, the onerous deals of the Spanish-born merchants who monopolized export-import trade and credit facilities, the despotic and arbitrary colonial governors and the lack of representation in the colonial government. Progressively fueled by the political and economic ideals of the contemporary liberal and democratic movements, this frustration would lead a growing sector of the landed bourgeoisie to escalate their demands for political representation in the insular and municipal governments within the Spanish political framework, for free trade and free labor (that is, for the abolition of slavery and forced labor) and even, among a few of the most radical liberal sectors, for equal civil rights for women and non-whites. For sure, the landed bourgeoisie was not alone in articulating and pressing for

these demands, for in doing so they followed the example and leadership of their intellectual and professional offsprings, who on account of the increasing wealth of their parents had gone abroad in growing numbers to pursue their higher and professional studies--chiefly to Spain, but also to other European countries, Latin American and the U.S.--where they absorbed a large dose of the ideals of liberalism and representative democrachy that were then in vogue. Amidst sharp regressions and repressive reactions from the part of the colonial authorities, and with the indirect help of their more revolutionary Cuban counterparts, the insular liberal creole elites made significant--albeit very slow--progress toward the attainment of their liberal and autonomist aspirations. And they could claim much success in that regard in 1897 with the granting to Puerto Rico of the Autonomist Charter, though this triumph was very short lived for it came just a few months before the U.S. occupation which drastically wiped out the liberal gains,and with these, the creole elites from their briefly attained positions of political and economic power.

With this event, the creole elites were also eliminated from their briefly held hegemonic position in the educational sphere, a position likewise gained through the representative insular and municipal bodies provided by the Autonomist Charter. Before the enactment of this

Charter and throughout the 19th century, the colonial authorities not only took important steps in promoting the expansion of formal schooling but also in asserting their centralized and oftentimes arbitrary control over the whole formal educational sphere now at the expense of all the creole sectors, including their elites. In fact, one might say that this was done even at the expense of the Catholic Church, though the latter continued to be not only among the principal educational agencies of the colony but also the official Church of the State in which capacity it retained throughout the century a great deal of ideological and moral control and supervision over all formsof private and public schooling. Nevertheless, in such a capacity, the Church also continued to serve as an ideological arm of the despotic colonial authorities, providing through both its evangelizing and educational activities, legitimating support for the former, a role that it performed in Puerto Rico even during the first half of the century, while in Spain,the liberal and monarchical constitutional governments and the Church were at war with each other. At any rate, when during the second half of the 19th century the insular liberal sectors began to press more forcefully for the liberalization of the colonial bureaucracy and the secularization of education--or more properly of secondary education--the Church defended energetically not just its

dogmatic scholastic educational practices but also the authoritarism and conservative colonial policies of Spain in Puerto Rico.

Overall, there was during the 19th century, an unprecedented expansion of primary schooling in Puerto Rico as well as notable additions in secondary and professional education, developments which responded to a variety of conditions and pressures. On the one hand, while still very poor, the Island was generating more material surplus from which to pay the costs of formal schooling, a situation made possible by the growth of the commercial agricultural economy and, hence, by the increased wealth appropriated by the landed and merchant bourgeoisie and through these, by the colonial authorities, from the insular working population. Moreover, this growth in the commercial economy in combination with the dramatic increase in the insular population, allowed for the expansion in the number and size of the urban concentrations which though still relatively small, made the establishment of schools more feasible and practical, and provided the cultural conditions (e.g. commercial exchanges, legal-administrative procedures, literacy materials) and social groupings (e.g. intellectuals, civil servants, merchants, artisans) that in addition to the landed bourgeoisie, and the colonial and ecclesiastical authorities, were most

favorable for the expansion of some form or other of formal schooling.

On the other hand, the pressures from these groupings for school expansion were grounded on a diversity of motivations and reasons. Thus, one sees the colonial State, amidst the social turmoils of the century, seeking at one level to organize a public primary school system, capable of making the Islanders loyal subjects of Spain and its colonial policies, and at another level, to support institutions of secondary education and the establishment of academic chairs in advanced and professional fields in order, at least in part, to prevent the sons of the creole elite from going to pursue such studies in countries where they could be contaminated by subversive or unorthodox political and religious ideas. One sees, moreover, the landed and urban bourgeoisie pressing for the establishment of secondary and post-secondary educational institutions on the Island in order to secure more easily the high status, professional and intellectual positions for their sons. At the same time one sees the more liberal sectors among the bourgeoisie as well as their liberal and meritocratically-oriented intellectual and professional offsprings, pressing in addition for the reformation of those institutions in more scientific-technical direction as well as for the establishment of a mass public school system

which along with providing expanded occupational opportunities for the members of these elite groups could simultaneously discipline the working masses and improve their productive and liberal democratic citizenship skills. On the other side, one sees urban artisans pressing for popular art and trade schools,not merely as agencies for their own enlightenment and technical training,but also as a means of limiting their potential competition in the increasingly proletarized working classes.

Certainly, the conditions and pressures for the expansion of schooling in Puerto Rico cannot be overestimated, for in spite of all, the Island was still very poor, its urban centers small, its potentially school-demanding bourgeois, intellectual, professional and artisan sectors tiny and weak, and all of this while the overwhelming majority of the population was still rural and highly apathetic to any form of schooling. Thus, despite some expansion in primary schooling--an expansion that incorporated a significant proportion of women as well as non-whites, though not as extensive as men and whites, and at any rate, through patriarchally and racially differentiated programs--it remained almost exclusively an urban phenomena and on the whole it hardly could keep pace with the rapid increase of the insular population. Hence, by the end of Spanish rule, the literacy rate of the Island

had risen to only 16.6 percent. On the other hand, notwithstanding the increased availability of secondary, professional and art and trade schools in Puerto Rico, these catered to only a very small minority of the corresponding age-group population, and with the exception of the one or two trade schools, and of one secondary school and one normal school for women, they remained basically very elitist, male and university oriented institutions. Moreover, by the conclusion of the century, even the insular elites still did not have a university or post-secondary degree granting institution on the Island, and while this lack was overcome by an increasing number of wealthy families who could send their sons to study abroad, it still represented a great source of frustration for the local elites as well as a considerable constraint for the expansion of the local intellectual and professional groupings.

The thirty-two years of U.S. colonial rule in Puerto Rico covered in Chapters IV and V can be more easily summarized here than the almost 400 years of Spanish rule covered in Chapters II and III, not just because of the briefness of the period, but also because the events and developments reviewed were in large measure more straightforward and continuous. This in no way should be seen as lessening the momentousness of those events and develop-

ments, for in fact the colonization of Puerto Rico by the U.S., fueled by the missionary, ethnocentric drive of its Anglo-Protestant, liberal democratic and industrial civilization and by the imperialistic expansionism of its increasingly strong and centralized federal government and corporate capitalist economy, signaled a sharp transformation of the Island's political, socio-economic and cultural-educational spheres, including the nature of these spheres' power-conflict dynamics.

In a sense, the change from Spanish to U.S. colonial domination marked a sharp intensification of trends that were already developing in varying degrees throughout the 19th century, as, for instance, the expansion of an agro-export-monocultural capitalist economy; the increased trade dependency on the U.S. market; the massive transformation of small farm owners and subsistence farmers into dependent rural and urban wage-laborers; the extension of the administrative, coercive and ideological power of the central colonial government; the expansion of a State-controlled and supported public school system; and the rise of a liberal and meritocratically oriented groupings of professionals and intellectuals. However, U.S. colonialism, with the establishment on the Island of a highly expanded and centralized colonial governmental and public educational apparatuses, with the rapid penetration and

domination of the insular economy by U.S. agro-export (principally sugar) corporations, and with its wholesale attempt of "Americanizing" the insular population, imparted a drastic re-orientation to such trends, as well as to other social features of the Island--e.g. patriarchy and institutional racism--that were to be subsequently reproduced in modified forms.

But the impact of such colonialism on the Puerto Rican society was far more radical and extensive than this. Among other things, it displaced a large sector of the insular landed bourgeoisie if not from their lands, from their control over agricultural production. In addition, by eliminating, as mentioned above, the self-government, representative and decentralized features of the Autonomist regime, it eliminated the briefly attained political and cultural-educational hegemony of the local bourgeoisie and intelligentsia. Furthermore, by secularizing the colonial apparatus and the public educational system, it eliminated the State-sanctioned religious monopoly and educational influence of the Catholic Church, and opened the Island to the missionary and "Americanizing" efforts of a variety of U.S. Protestant churches, a blow from which the Catholic Church would gradually recover--including its role of providing primary and secondary education for the insular elite--but then as another "Americanizing" agency, rather

than a "Hispanizing" one.

Furthermore, the policies and transformations generated under U.S. colonial rule facilitated the rise of a militant and organized proletariat and the substantial incorporation of women into the blue collar, white collar and professional sectors of the labor force, along with their growing participation in public life. As shown in Chapters IV and V, various factors contributed to this. One fundamental development regarding the working class--and here one may speak of both of its white and non-white components--was that the intensified proletarization of peasants and urban artisans that resulted from the radical penetration of U.S. agro-export corporations in the Island during this period was accompanied by the imposition on that working population of more impersonal, regimented and collectivized forms of labor control, which though not less exploitative, facilitated nonetheless, a greater degree of collective class consciousness and a greater degree of class combativeness. The latter found organized and militant expression--as well as further formative influence, though in later years this influence was more moderating than militant--in the FLT and Socialist Party. Partly as a result of the activism of these organizations and partly also as a result of the pressures of organized labor in the U.S., the colonial authorities gradually extended to

the insular working class, on a much more firm and continuous basis than ever done under Spanish rule, the formal democratic rights of suffrage, freedom of assembly, collective association and expression; rights also formally granted to non-whites and women, although to the latter, suffrage was extended on a more delayed and limited basis. In spite of this and of the overall colonial, class, patriarchal and racial constraints in the equal and effective exercize of these rights, these provided the popular and female sectors with valuable legal-organizational means for the articulation and defense of their demands, whether through the Socialist Party and the FLT or, as in the case of upper class and professional women, the suffragist organizations.

Interestingly, the notable incorporation of women into the wage and salaried labor force happened not only in the low paying blue collar jobs in the U.S. owned tobacco and needle work industries, but also in the lowest paying categories of the expanding white collar and professional occupations, namely in the increasing number of clerical, nursing and teaching positions of the enlarging colonial bureaucracy and public educational system. Significantly, the sharp expansion of the public educational system during the first three decades of U.S. rule provided not merely an enlarged source of teaching

positions for women (chiefly in the primary level) but also a more widened--though patriarchally differentiated--source of educational opportunities for them, including, in the secretarial and teachers training departments of the University of Puerto Rico. In all, the increased incorporation of women in the labor market and the school system seems to have greatly stimulated their increased participation in public life, as illustrated for instance in their active involvement in the suffragist movement, the FLT and the Socialist Party.

Surely, the large expansion of public education during this period of U.S. rule increased substantially the schooling opportunities not just of women but also of the overall insular population, including in this respect, both the local elites and the popular, working classes. And certainly, while this expansion remained patriarchally differentiated, class elitist and racially biased (at least in terms of access to the secondary and post-secondary levels), and on the whole mostly inaccessible to the rural population, it nevertheless reflected a strong commitment from the part of the U.S. colonial authorities to provide primary schools to the popular masses--even to the rural masses, though with respect to these, they were rather unsuccessful--and secondary and post-secondary schools to the upper and middle classes. Significantly enough, this

commitment clearly reflected in turn the fundamental and overriding concern of those authorities in using the public educational system as the chief agency for "Americanizing" the Puerto Rican people and for preparing its elites as leaders and intermediaries--whether in government, business, in teaching or other intellectual/professional/managerial sectors--of the "Americanization" process and of all facets of U.S. colonial rule. This concern is also shown, incidentally, in the support given by the colonial authorities to the high level graduate and professional training of the insular elite in the institutions of higher learning of the U.S., which served in an important sense, even after the foundation of the University of Puerto Rico in 1903, as the apex of the Island's school system.

But "Americanization", like the broader colonial process to which it belonged, was plagued with crucial ironies and contradictions. At the most general and idealistic sense, "Americanization", as an expression of the ethnocentric "civilizing" drive of the colonizers, was supposed to transform Puerto Ricans into Anglo-speakers, and to train them in the pragmatic, industrious and liberal democratic habits of the North Americans. It is, however, profoundly ironic that despite the often repeated liberating and democratic goals of the U.S. in Puerto Rico, the U.S. authorities imposed on the Island, through the subsequent

establishment of the military government (1898) and two civil regimes, an increasingly centralized colonial apparatus, which while allowing for the gradual extension of civil and political rights to the Islanders, crucially constrained their capacities to exercize liberal democratic self-rule at both the insular and municipal spheres of government. And curiously, in justifying the maintenance of such undemocratic colonial apparatus, they argued that given the alleged inexperience of Puerto Ricans with self-government, the latter could only be partially and gradually entrusted with it, for they required a long period of education and training in that respect, under the strong guiding hand of U.S. authorities. It is also ironic that this task was to be chiefly realized by the establishment of an "American" public educational system, which though certainly secular, co-educational, and, at the primary level, mass oriented in character, was not only, to repeat, class elitist, patriarchally differentiated and racially biased, but also highly hierarchically organized and centralized in the hands of U.S. appointed colonial authorities. By facilitating a greater degree of control and uniformity in the supervising, teaching, evaluating of curricular development and instructional material production activities of the school system as well as a more efficient system of generating school revenues, such centralized

structure apparently was very useful for the large expansion of school facilities and enrollment, and with this, for the more effective mass difussion of the "Americanization" policies, including among these the mass instruction of English, which was the policy that received major attention and emphasis from the part of the colonial authorities. But irrespective of the libertarian and democratic rhetoric which dressed these policies, the profoundly hierarchical and centralized organizational structure of the "American" school system that was established and the authoritarian-prescriptive, rote-learning interactions that characterized much of its instructional activities, allowed very little room, on the one hand, for citizen's and teacher's initiatives and decision-making at the insular and muncipal levels, and on the other, for the development in students of the democratic skills and habits of critical thinking, debate and decision making.

It is true that with regard to the acculturation of Puerto Ricans in the "pragmatism" and industrious habits of the North Americans, the colonial authorities made some important efforts that were beyond the mere occassional emphasis at a rhetorical level. Even so, the actual accomplishments in this respect were rather limited and on the whole, the curriculum and instruction of the public primary and secondary schools remained fundamentally formal,

literary-based and bookish in character, and concerned considerably more in developing in students the basic bilingual, Spanish-English, literacy skills and a deep sense of respect and loyalty for the institutions of U.S. rule, than in developing any specific technical or productive skills. At any rate, it seems very likely that the small efforts that were undertaken in agricultural and industrial education at the primary and secondary levels were more than enough to satisfy the demands for skilled or trained labor in the labor market, for the type of economic activity that prevailed in the Island, namely that associated with the large-scale agro-export plantations and industries, required only a minimum of technical skills.

Nevertheless, the forms of instruction that prevailed in the insular public school system, and which in fact prevailed even in the trade and vocational offerings--that is, the hierarchical prescriptive, rote-learning, clock-regimented, literate and bookish forms of instruction--might have been very useful indeed for ensuring the discipline and subservience of the new generation of Puerto Ricans to the new "American" bureaucratic and capitalist social order that was being established on the Island by the U.S. government and by the U.S. agro-export corporations. On the other hand, such forms of

instruction, and particularly that available in the secondary schools might have been very useful for entering if not into the clerical and low-level white collar occupations of the expanding governmental and business bureaucracies, into the post-secondary educational institutions.

And in fact, in a crucial sense, it was with the establishment and extension of the University of Puerto Rico that U.S. colonial authorities achieved the principal and most lasting accomplishments in providing vocational training on the Island as well as in adapting such training to the occupational demands of the colonial enterprise. Thus, aside from serving primarily as a training center for the teachers of the insular "American" public school system, it gradually expanded to provide a significant part of the professional, technocratic and bureaucratic training--e.g. the lawyers, doctors, pharmacists, chemists, agricultural experts, engineers, accountants and clerical secretaries--required by the colonial apparatus and the commerical agro-export economy.

Undoubtedly, the efforts of the U.S. colonial authorities regarding university education, both in establishment of the insular University and in supporting the studies of Puerto Ricans in North American universities, along with the substantial increase of professional,

administrative and technocratic positions that resulted from the enlargement of the colonial governmental and educational apparatus, and the commercial, agro-export bureaucracies, provided the local elites, including the displaced insular landed bourgeoisie, with a considerably expanded alternative source of power and wealth for their children, one basedon the possession of university credentials rather than on the property of land or the means of production. Moreover, by incorporating a large number of the children of these elites as intermediaries and agents of the colonial process, the U.S. authorities succeeded to some extent in ameliorating the anti-colonial forces which might have sprung from those social sectors in much the same way that they succeeded throughout this period--with the substantial extension to workers not only of civil and labor rights, but also of primary schooling--in gaining the support and loyalty of the FLT and Socialist Party, even while these engaged in militant struggles against the exploitative U.S. owned sugar and tobacco corporations.

Of course, this is not to say that the colonial and "Americanization" policies of the U.S. in Puerto Rico did not generate any significant opposition from among the insular elites, for such opposition grew considerably throughout the years in both the bourgeois and intellectual sectors of the Island. But interestingly, one of the great

ironies of such opposition was that it came from social groups which at the beginning of U.S. rule in Puerto Rico not only gave a friendly and cooperative welcome to the U.S. invading forces, but also were generally in favor of the incorporation of the Island as a full territory and eventual state of the invading country as well as of the overall "Americanization" of the insular population. But soon, however, the colonial policies of the U.S. began to frustrate increasingly larger sectors of the insular elites--particularly those represented subsequently by the Federalist and Unionist parties--which had expected to gain not only substantial economic advantages from the new relationship with the U.S., but also through the rapid incorporation of the Island as a state of the U.S., much greater--even though "Americanized"--political and cultural autonomy than ever attained under Spain. Over time, moreover, as the U.S. procrastinated in extending statehood or self-rule to the Puerto Ricans, as its agro-export plantations and industries displaced the insular bourgeoisie from its lands; and--most relevantly in terms of making the public education system a principal arena of political controversy--as the colonial authorities intensified their attempts to rapidly "Americanize" the Islanders and transform them into English-speakers literates, while disregarding in varying degrees their Spanish language and

heritage; the pro-independence and nationalist forces within the insular elites gained in strength and momentum, and interestingly, this latter development found political expression not only in the Unionist, Independence and Nationalist parties of the 1910s and 1920s but also in the Puerto Rican Teacher's Association, which from its founding in 1911 took a growing, combative position against the English-language policies of the colonial authorities, and in defense of the Spanish language.

To be sure, it would not be until the years of the Great Depression in the 1930s that the anti-colonialist forces would present a real threat to U.S. rule in Puerto Rico by extending its influence beyond the insular bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia to the working classes; nevertheless,it is particularly relevant to the concerns of this study that one important factor which contributed to the growth of these forces in the 1930s was the growing incorporation into them, often in leadership positions, of the professional and intellectual strata--including their university-student component--that swelled considerably as a result of the increased opportunities in university education during the first three decades of the century, and which found themselves, with the dim employment prospects of the 1930s, increasingly disillusioned with what the colonial order had to offer them.

In all, then, one can see that there were a number of factors and conditions which contributed to the impressive expansion of schooling during the first three decades of U.S. rule. Undoubtedly,an important force behind such expansion was the increasingly proletarized, organized and, to some degree, urbanized, working class population, which through its growing involvement in organized labor and electoral politics under the leadership of the FLT and Socialist Party, organizations heavily influenced by a combination of nationalist popular democratic, trade-unionist and socialist ideologies, put growing pressure especially on the mass extension of public primary and trade schooling. Another force or set of forces were the declining insular landed bourgeoisie and the rising urban middle classes of businessmen, bureaucrats and professionals--including here,female professionals--pressuring in particular for the extension of secondary and university education,in order to ensure the professional education of their children,while monopolizing access to the professions. For a number of reasons, these forces would also press in varying degrees for the mass extension of primary schooling: reasons ranging from liberal democratic and meritocratic ones, through commercial, technical and bureaucratic ones, to those seeking to discipline the popular classes; but not least important among these

reasons,was that of increasing, with the growth of teaching positions, the employment opportunities of the insular elites.

However, more important than these local forces in the expansion of the public educational system, was the ethnocentric colonial drive of the U.S. authorities to rapidly "Americanize" all Puerto Ricans through the primary schools and in so doing, turn them into English-literate speakers loyal to the institutions of U.S. rule, a colonizing drive which required, in addition, the expansion of secondary and university education to train the local elites as its agents and intermediaries. With "Americanization" as a fundamental motivating factor, and with this drive backed by a highly centralized educational organization and by the increased governmental revenues made possible by the growth of the commercial, agro-export economy, the U.S. authorities succeeded in rising considerably the school enrollment and literacy rates of the insular population--the latter, for instance, from 22.7 percent in 1899 to 58.6 percent in 1930--and hence in greatly extending U.S. educational influence over wide sectors of the Island. Indeed, these increases may appear more impressive if one considers that they were achieved as the school-age population of the Island increased dramatically and despite of the fact that even though the

insular economy grew during most of this period, the Island still remained very poor. Of course, the "Americanization" drive was not enough to overcome the economic crisis of the 1920s and less so the Great Depression of the 1930s, two decades in which the increases in school facilities and school enrollments slowed down significantly. Lastly, and ironically, it could be argued that despite all the preceding increases in enrollment and literacy, these were to some extent slowed down by one central component of the "Americanization" program, that is, the emphasis on English instruction, which aside from generating increased opposition from the insular elites, apparently kept or forced out of the primary schools, a sizeable portion of the school age population.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbad y Lasierra, Fray Iñigo.
1971. Historia geográfica, civil y natural de la isla de San Juan Bautista de Puerto Rico. San Juan: Porta Coelli, Ediciones. (First published in 1785).

Albert, Michael, and Robin Hahnel.
1978. Unorthodox Marxism. Boston: South End Press.
1981. Marxism and Socialist Theory. Boston: South End Press.

Alegría, Ricardo E.
1969. Descubrimiento, conquista y colonización de Puerto Rico, 1493-1599, San Juan: Colección de Estudios Puertorriqueños.
1980. "La población aborigen antillana y su relación con otras áreas de America." In Aida Caro Costas, Antologia de lecturas de historia de Puerto Rico. San Juan: Editorial Universitaria, pp. 53-70.

Altamira, Rafael.
1930. A History of Spanish Civilization. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc.

Althusser, Louis.
1977. "Ideology and the State Ideological Apparatuses." In Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays. London: New Left Books.

Aries, Philippe.
1965. Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life. New York: Vintage Books.

Artola, Miguel.
1975. La burguesía revolucionaria (1808-1874). Madrid: Alianza Universidad.

Bachrach, Peter.
1967. The Theory of Democratic Elitism.Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Bailyn, Bernard.
1960. Education in the Forming of American Society: Needs and Opportunities for Study. Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina Press.

Bandelot, Christian, and Roger Establet.
1975. La escuela capitalista. México: Siglo XXI.

Berbusse, Edward J.
1966. The United States in Puerto Rico, 1898-1900. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

Bergad, Laird W.
1978. "Agrarian History of Puerto Rico, 1870-1930."

In Latin American Research Review, XIII(3), pp.69-94.

Bernstein, Basil.
1977. Class, Codes and Control, Volume 3: Towards a Theory of Educational Transmissions. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Bernstein, Richard J.
1971. Praxis and Action. Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press.

Bobbio, Norberto.
1978. ¿Qué Socialismo? Barcelona: Plaza & Janés, S.A. Editores.

Bookchin, Murray.
1980. Toward an Ecological Society. Montreal: Black Rose Books.
1982. The Ecology of Freedom. Palo Alto: Cheshire Books.

Bothwell, Reece B.
1979. Puerto Rico: Cien años de lucha política. 4 vols. Río Piedras: Editorial Universitaria.

Bourdien, Pierre, and Jean-Claude Passeron.
1977. Reproduction: In Education, Society and Culture. Beverly Hills: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Bowen, James.
1975. A History of Western Education. 2 vols. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Bowles, Samuel, and Herbert Gintis.
1977. Schooling in Capitalist America. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers.

Brau, Salvador.
1966. Historia de Puerto Rico. San Juan: Editorial Coquí.
1966. La colonización de Puerto Rico. San Juan: Instituto de Cultura Puertorriqueña.
1972. Ensayos: Disquisiciones Sociológicas. Río Piedras: Editorial Edil, Inc.

Braudel, Fernand.
1976. The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II. 2 vols. New York: Harper and Row.

Butts, R. Freeman, and Lawrence Cremin.
1953. A History of Education in American Culture. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Callahan, Raymond E.
1962. Education and the Cult of Efficiency. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Campos, Ricardo.
1974. Apuntes sobre la expresión cultural obrera en Puerto Rico. Río Piedras: CEREP.

Caro Costas, Aida R.
1980. Antología de Lecturas de historia de Puerto Rico (Siglos XV-XVIII). San Juan: Editorial Universitaria.
Carrión, Juan Manuel.
1980. "The Petty Bourgeoisie and the Struggle for Independence in Puerto Rico." In Adalberto López, ed. The Puerto Ricans: Their History, Culture, and Society. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman Publishing Company, Inc., pp.233-256.
Carroll, Henry K.
1899. Report on the Island of Porto Rico; Its Population, Civil Government, Commerce, Industries, Productions, Roads, Tariff, and Currency With Recommendations. Washington: Government Printing Office.
Carroll, Peter N., and David W. Noble.
1977. The Free and the Unfree: A New History of the United States. New York: Penguin Books.
Castoriadis, Cornelius.
1977. "On the History of the Workers' Movement." In Telos, 30, pp. 3-42.
Spring 1980. "Socialism and the Autonomous Society." In Telos, 43, pp. 91-106.
Cebollero, Pedro A.
1945. La política liguística-escolar de Puerto Rico. Consejo Superior de Enseñanza, Universidad de Puerto Rico.
Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños.
1979. Labor Migration Under Capitalism: the Puerto Rican Experience. New York: Monthly Review Press.
Christopulos, Diana.
1974. "Puerto Rico in the Twentieth Century: A Historical Survey." In Adalberto López and James Petras, eds. Puerto Rico and Puerto Ricans. New York: John Wiley & Sons, pp. 123-163.
Cipolla, Carlo.
1970. Educación desarrollo en Occidente. Barcelona: Ediciones Ariel.
Clark, Truman R.
1973. "Educating the Natives in Self-Government: Puerto Rico and the United States, 1900-1933." In Pacific Historical Review, XLII (2), pp. 220-239.
1975. Puerto Rico and the United States, 1917-1933. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
Clark, Victor S.
1900. "Education in Puerto Rico." In The Forum. XXX, pp. 229-237.
1930. Porto Rico and its Problems. Washington: The Brookings Institution.

Cohen, Sheldon S.
1974. A History of Colonial Education, 1607-1776. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
Collins, Randall.
1975. Conflict Sociology. New York: Academic Press.
1977. "Some Comparative Principes Educational Stratification." In Harvard Educational Review. 47 (1), pp. 1-27.
1979. The Credential Society: An Historical Sociology of Education and Stratification. New York: Academic Press.
Coll y Toste, Cayetano, ed.
1922. "Historia de Puerto Rico: Principios de la Colonización de la Isla." In Boletín Histórico de Puerto Rico. Vol. IX. San Juan: Tip. Cantero, Fernández y Co., pp. 93-101.
1970. Historia de la Instrucción Pública en Puerto Rico hasta el año 1898. San Juan: Isabel Cuchí Coll. (First published Boletín Mercantil, 1910.)
1980. "La propiedad territorial en Puerto Rico. Su desenvolvimiento histórico." In Aida Caro Costa, Antología de lecturas de historia de Puerto Rico. San Juan: Editorial Universitaria, pp. 685-712.
Colón Rosado, Anibal.
1981. Crisis de identidad de la educación Católica en Puerto Rico. Santurce: Cultural Puertorriqueña.
Comisión sobre Reforma Educativa.
1977. Informe Final. Hato Rey, Puerto Rico.
Cossío, Manuel B.
1915. La enseñanza primaria en España. Madrid: Museo Pedagógico Nacional.
Cremin, Lawrence A.
1964. The Transformation of the School. New York: Vintage Books.
1970. American Education: The Colonial Experience 1607-1783. New York: Harper & Row.
1977. Traditions of American Education. New York: Basic Books.
1980. American Education: The National Experience 1783-1876. New York: Harper & Row.
Crozier, Michael.
1964. The Bureaucratic Phenomenon. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
Cruz Monclova, Lidio.
1965. Historia de Puerto Rico (Siglo XIX). Vol. I.
1970. Historia de Puerto Rico (Siglo XIX). Vol. II. Río Piedras: Editorial Universitaria.
1966. "The Puerto Rican Political Movement in the 19th Century." In U.S. Puerto Rican Commission on the

Status of Puerto Rico, Status of Puerto Rico, pp. 1-49.

Cuesta Mendoza, Antonio.
1937. Historia de la educación en Puerto Rico (1512-1826). Washington: The Catholic University of America.
1946. Historia de la educación en el Puerto Rico Colonial 1508-1821. Vol. I. México.
1948. Historia de la educación en el Puerto Rico Colonial, 1821-1898. Vol. II. Ciudad Trujillo, República Dominicana: Imprenta Arte y Cine.

Curti, Merle.
1978. The Social Ideas of American Educators. Totowa: Littlefield, Adams & Co.

Descartes, S.L.
1946. Basic Statistics on Puerto Rico. Washington, D.C.: Office of Puerto Rico.

Díaz Soler, Luis M.
1960. Rosendo Matienzo Cintrón. Río Piedras: Ediciones del Instituto de Literatura Puertorriqueña.
1974. Historia de la Esclavitud Negra en Puerto Rico. Editorial Universitaria, Universidad de Puerto Rico.

Diffie, Bailey W., and Justine W.
1931. Porto Rico: A Broken Pledge. New York: The Vanguard Press.

Durkheim, Emile.
1956. Education and Sociology. Glencoe: The Free Press.
1961. Moral Education. Glencoe: The Free Press.
1964. The Division of Labor in Society. New York: Free Press.

Edwards, Richard C., et al.
1972. The Capitalist System. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Eisenstein, Zillah, ed.
1979. Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case for Socialist Feminism. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Elliott, J.H.
1966. Imperial Spain, 1469-1716. New York: Mentor Book.

Fernández Méndez, Eugenio.
1975. Historia Cultural de Puerto Rico 1493-1968. Editorial Universitaria Universidad de Puerto Rico.
1976. Cronicas de Puerto Rico. Editorial U.P.R., Universidad de Puerto Rico.

Fife, Robert H., and Herschel T. Manuel.
1976. "History of English Instruction." In Osvaldo Rodríguez Pacheco, A Land of Hope in Schools. San Juan: Ediciones Edil, pp. 111-136.

Foner, Philip.
1972. The Spanish-Cuban-American War and the Birth of

American Imperialism. 2 vols. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Figueroa, Loida.
1968. Breve Historia de Puerto Rico: Desde sus Comienzos hasta 1800. Vol. 1. Río Piedras: Editorial Edil, Inc.
1970. Breve Historia de Puerto Rico: Desde 1801 a 1892. Vol. II. Río Piedras: Editorial Edil, Inc.

Frank, Andre Gunder
1978. World Accumulation, 1942-1789. New York: Monthly Review Press.
1979. Dependent Accumulation and Underdevelopment. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Freire, Paulo.
1970. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: Herder & Herder.

Galvin, Miles.
1976. "The Early Development of the Organized Labor Movement in Puerto Rico." In Latin American Perspectives. II (3), pp. 17-35.

García, Gervasio.
1974. "La economía natural colonial de Puerto Rico en el siglo XIX." Río Piedras: CEREP (mimeo).
1974. "Primeros fermentos de organización obrera en Puerto Rico." Río Piedras: CEREP (mimeo).

García, Gervasio L., and A.G. Quintero Rivera.
1982. Desafío y solidaridad: breve historia del movimiento obrero puertorriqueño. Río Piedras: Ediciones Huracán.

García de Serrano, Irma.
1969. La selección de personal en el servicio público de Puerto Rico. Río Piedras: Editorial Universitaria.
1971. The Puerto Rico Teachers' Association and its Relationship to Teacher Personnel Administration. Río Piedras: University of Puerto Rico Press.

García Ochoa, María A.
1982. La política española en Puerto Rico durante el siglo XIX. Río Piedras: Editorial de la Universidad de Puerto Rico.

Geertz, Clifford.
1973. The Interpretation of Cultures. New York: Basic Books.

Gerth, H.H., and C. Wright Mills.
1958. From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. New York: Oxford University Press.

Giddens, Anthony.
1975. The Class Structure of the Advanced Societies. New York: Harper Torchbooks.
1976. New Rules of Sociological Method. London: Hutchinson & Co.

1979. Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis. Berkely: University of California Press.

Gómez Acevedo, Labor.
1956. Sanz, promotor de la conciencia separatista en Puerto Rico. Rio Piedras: Editorial Universitaria.
1970. Organización y Reglamentación del Trabajo en el Puerto Rico del Siglo XIX. San Juan: Instituto de Cultura Puertorriqueña.

Gómez Acevedo, Labor and Manuel Ballesteros Gaibrois.
1980. Vida y cultura precolombinas de Puerto Rico. Rio Piedras: Editorial Cultural, Inc.

Gómez, Tejera, Carmen and David Cruz Lopez.
1970. La escuela puertorriqueña. Sharon: Trootman Press.

Goodman, Paul.
1966. Compulsory Mis-Education and the Community of Scholars. New York: Vintage Books.
1970. New Reformation: Notes of a Neolithic Conservative. New York: Random House.

Gould, Lyman J.
1969. La Ley Foraker: Raíces de la política Colonial de los Estados Unidos. Universidad de Puerto Rico: Editorial U.P.R.

Gouldner, Alvin W.
1971. The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology. New York: Equinox Books.
1982a. The Dialectic of Ideology and Technology. New York: Oxford University Press.
1982b. The Future of Intellectuals and the Rise of the New Class. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gramci, Antonio.
1957. The Modern Prince and Other Writings. New York: International Publishers.

Gutiérrez del Arroyo, Isabel.
1953. El reformismo ilustrado en Puerto Rico. México D.F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
1974. Conjunción de Elementos del Medioevo y la Modernidad en la Conquista y Colonización de Puerto Rico. San Juan: Instituto de Cultural Puertorriqueña.

Habermas, Jurgen.
1970. Toward a Rational Society. Boston: Beacon Press.
1971. Knowledge and Human Interests. Boston: Beacon Press.
1974. Theory and Practice. Boston: Beacon Press.
1975. Legitimation Crisis. Boston: Beacon Press.
1979. Communication and the Evolution of Society. Boston: Beacon Press.

Halperin Donghi, Tulio.
1969. Historia contemporánea de América Latina. Madrid: Alianza Editorial.
Haring, C.H.
1963. The Spanish Empire in America. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.
Harris, William T.
1899. "An Educational Policy for Our New Possessions." In Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the National Educational Association, pp. 69-79.
Healy, David.
1970. U.S. Expansionism: The Imperialist Urge in the 1890s. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.
Henríquez Ureña, Pedro.
1947. Historia de la cultura en la América hispánica. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
Herr, Richard.
1969. The Eighteenth-Century Revolution in Spain. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
1974. An Historical Essay on Modern Spain. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Horkheimer, Max.
1972. Critical Theory. New York: The Seabury Press.
Hostos, Adolfo de.
1966. Historia de San Juan: Ciudad Murada, 1521-1898. San Juan: Instituto de Cultura Puertorriqueña.
Hostos, Eugenio María de.
1939. Madre Isla. Vol. V of Obras Completas. Habana, Cuba: Cultural S.A.
Hunter, Robert J.
1966. "Historical Survey of the Puerto Rico Status Question, 1898-1965." In U.S. Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico, Status of Puerto Rico, pp. 50-145.
Illich, Ivan.
1971. De-Schooling Society. New York: Harper and Row,
International Institute of Teachers' College.
1926. A Survey of the Public Educational System of Puerto Rico. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University.
Kagan, Richard L.
1974. Students and Society in Early Modern Spain. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
Karabel, Jerome, and A.H. Halsey, eds.
1977. Power and Ideology in Education. New York: Oxford University Press.
Karier, Clarence J., et al.
1973. Roots of Crisis: American Education in the Twentieth Century. Chicago: McWally & Co.

Katz, Michael B.
1968. The Irony of Early School Reform. Boston: Beacon Press.
1971a. Class, Bureaucracy, and Schools. New York: Praeger Publishers.
1971b. School Reform: Past and Present. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.

Knowles, William.
1966. "Unionism and Politics in Puerto Rico." In U.S. Puerto Rican Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico, Status of Puerto Rico, pp. 315-338.

Kolko, Gabriel.
1977. The Triumph of Conservatism. New York: Free Press.

Konrad, George, and Ivan Szelenyi.
1979. The Intellectuals on the Road to Class Power. New York: Harcourt Brace Javanovich.

LaFeber, Walter.
1963. The New Empire: An Interpretation of American Expansion, 1860-1898. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Lanning, John T.
1940. Academic Culture in the Spanish Colonies. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ledru, André Pierre.
1957. Viaje a la isla de Puerto Rico. Río Piedras: Ediciones del Instituto de Literatura Puertorriqueña, Universidad de Puerto Rico. (First edition, 1863).

Lichtheim, George.
1967. The Concept of Ideology and Other Essays. New York: Vintage Books.

Lindsay, Samuel M.
1903. "The Public School System in Porto Rico." In Register of Porto Rico for 1903. San Juan, pp. 72-79.

Lockridge, Kenneth A.
1974. Literacy in Colonial New England: An Inquiry into the Social Context of Literacy in the Early Modern West. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.

López, Adalberto.
1974a. "The Beginnings of Colonization, 1493-1800." In A. López and J. Petras, eds., Puerto Rico and Puerto Ricans: Studies in History and Society. New York: John Wiley and Sons, pp. 12-41.
1974b. "Socio-Politico Developments in a Colonial Context: Puerto Rico on the Nineteenth Century." In A. López and J. Petras, eds., Puerto Rico and Puerto Ricans: Studies in History and Society. New York: John Wiley & Sons, pp. 42-86.

Lukes, Steven.
1973. Individualism. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Luque de Sánchez, María D.
1980. La ocupación norteamericana y la ley Foraker. Río Piedras: Editorial Universitaria.
McNeill, William H.
1979. A world History. New York: Oxford University Press.
Macpherson, C.B.
1973. Democratic Theory. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
1977. The Life and Times of Liberal Democracy. New York: Oxford University Press.
Marx, Karl.
1965. The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte. New York: International Publishers.
Matthews, Thomas.
1970. La política puertorriqueña y el Nuevo Trato. Río Piedras: Editorial Universitaria.
1974. "The Question of Color in Puerto Rico." In Robert Brent Toplin, ed., Slavery and Race Relations in Latin America. Westport: Greenwood Press, pp. 299-323.
Mattos Cintrón, Wilfredo.
1980. La política y lo político en Puerto Rico. México D.F.: Ediciones Era S.A.
Mendel, Gerard, and Christian Vogt.
1975. El manifiesto de la educación. México: Siglo XXI.
Mintz, Sidney W.
1951. "The Role of Forced Labor in Nineteenth Century Puerto Rico." Caribbean Historical Review, 2, pp. 134-41.
1971. "The Caribbean as a Socio-cultural Area." In Michael M. Horowitz, ed., Peoples and Cultures of the Caribbean. Garden City: the Natural History Press, pp. 17-46.
Morales Carrión, Arturo.
1972. Albores históricos del capitalismo en Puerto Rico. Río Piedras: Editorial Universitaria.
1974. Puerto Rico and the Non-Hispanic Caribbean: A Study in the Decline of Spanish Exclusionism. University of Puerto Rico.
1980. Historia del Pueblo de Puerto Rico (Desde sus orígenes hasta el siglo XVIII). San Juan: Editorial Cordillera, Inc.
Moscoso, Francisco.
1980. "Chiefdom and Encomienda in Puerto Rico: The Development of Tribal Society and the Spanish Colonization to 1530." In Adalberto López, ed., The Puerto Ricans: Their History, Culture, and Society. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman Publishing Co., Inc., pp. 3-24.

Nasaw, David.
1981. Schooled to Order: A Social History of Public Schooling in the United States. New York: Oxford University Press.

Negrón de Montilla, Aida.
1970. Americanization in Puerto Rico and the Public-School System, 1900-1930. Río Piedras: Editorial Edil, Inc.

Negrón Portillo, Mariano.
1981. El autonomismo puertorriqueño: su transformación ideológica, 1895-1914. Río Piedras: Ediciones Huracán.

Neill, A.S.
1960. Summerhill. New York: Hart Publishers.

Nieves Falcón, Luis.
1965. Recruitment to Higher Education in Puerto Rico, 1940-1960. San Juan: Editorial Universitaria.

O'Reylly, Alejandro.
1980. "Memoria de D. Alejandro O'Reylly sobre la isla de Puerto Rico." In Aida Caro Costas, Antología de lecturas de historia de Puerto Rico (Siglos XV-XVII). San Juan: Editorial Universitaria, pp. 453-484.

Ortiz, Altagracia.
1983. Eighteenth-Century Reforms in the Caribbean: Miguel de Muesas, Governor of Puerto Rico, 1769-76. East Brunswick: Associated University Press, Inc.

Osuna, Juan José.
1949. A History of Education in Puerto Rico. Río Piedras: Editorial de la Universidad de Puerto Rico.

Ots Capdequi, J.S.
1946. El estado español en las Indias. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Pagán, Bolívar.
1959. Historia de los partidos políticos puertorriqueños. 2 vols. San Juan: Librería Campos.

Pantojas García, Emilio.
1974. "La iglesia protestante y la americanización en Puerto Rico." In Revista de Ciencias Sociales, XVIII, 1-2 (March-June), pp. 97-122.

Parsons, Talcott.
1951. The Social System. Glencove: The Free Press.
1966. Societies: Evolutionary and Comparative Perspectives. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Pateman, Carole.
1970. Participation and Democratic Theory. Cambridge, Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.

Payne, Stanley G.
1973. A History of Spain and Portugal. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press. 2 vols.

Pedreira, Antonio S.
1937. Un hombre de pueblo, José Celso Barbosa. San Juan: Imprenta Venezuela.
1948. El año terrible del 87. San Juan: Biblioteca de Autores Puertorriqueños.
1964. Hostos: Ciudadano de América. San Juan: Instituto de Cultura Puertorriqueña.
1969. El periodismo en Puerto Rico. Río Piedras: Editorial Edil, Inc.

Perea, Salvador.
1972. Historia de Puerto Rico, 1537-1700. San Juan: Instituto de Cultura Puertorriqueña y Universidad Católica de Puerto Rico.

Perloff, Harvey S.
1950. Puerto Rico's Economic Future: A Study in Planned Development. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Petrovich, Janice R.
1979. "The Expansion of Post-Secondary Schooling in Puerto Rico." Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Piaget, Jean.
1976. To Understand is to Invent: The Future of Education. New York: Penguin Books.

Picó, Fernando.
1981a. Amargo café (los pequeños y medianos cafi-cultores de Utuado en la segunda mitad del siglo XIX). Río Piedras: Ediciones Huracán, Inc.
1981b. Libertad y servidumbre en el Puerto Rico del Siglo XIX. Río Piedras: Ediciones Huracán, Inc.

Picó de Hernández, Isabel.
1971. "¿Americanización o proletarización?" In La Escalera, V (5-6), pp. 33-36.
1974a. "Los estudiantes universitarios y el proceso político puertorriqueño (1903-1948)." Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University.
1974b. "Origins of the Puerto Rican Student Movement Under U.S. Domination (1903-1930)." In A. López & J. Petras, Puerto Rico and Puerto Ricans. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
1980. "Apuntes preliminares para el estudio de la mujer puertorriqueña y su participación en las luchas sociales de principios del siglo XX." In Edna Acosta Belén, La Mujer en la Sociedad Puertorriqueña. Río Piedras: Ediciones Huracán, pp. 23-40.

Porrata, Oscar E.
1949. A Suggested Policy for the Administration and Control of Public Education in Puerto Rico. Río Piedras: Puerto Rico Teachers Association.

Pratt, Julius W.
1955. A History of United States Foreign Policy. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
1964. Expansionists of 1898. Chicago: Quadrangle Books.

Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration.
1938. Census of Population and Agriculture. Washington: Government Printing Office.

Quintero Alfaro, Angel.
1972. Educación y cambio social en Puerto Rico: Una época crítica. Río Piedras: Editorial Universitaria.

Quintero Rivera, Angel G.
1974a. "Background to the Emergence of Imperialist Capitalism in Puerto Rico." In A. López and J. Petras, eds., Puerto Rico and Puerto Ricans: Studies in History and Society. New York: John Wiley and Sons, pp. 87-117.
1974-1976. "La Clase Obrera y el Proceso Político en Puerto Rico." In Revista de Ciencias Sociales. 18 (1-2), (1974b), pp. 145-198; 18 (3-4) (1974c), pp. 61-107; 19 (1) (1975a), pp. 47-100; 19 (3) (1975b), pp. 261-300; 20 (1) (1976a), pp. 3-48.
1976b. Conflictos de clase y política en Puerto Rico. Río Piedras: Ediciones Huracán, Inc.
1976c. Workers' Struggle in Puerto Rico. New York: Monthly Review Press.
1978. "Socialista y tabaquero: la proletarización de los artesanos." In Sin Nombre, 18 (4), pp. 100-137.
1980. "La base social de la transformación ideológica del Partido Popular en la década del '40." In Gerardo Novas Dávila, ed., Cambio y desarrollo en Puerto Rico: La transformación ideológica del Partido Popular Democrático. Universidad de Puerto Rico, Editorial Universitaria.

Rafucci de García, Carmen I.
1981. El gobierno civil y la ley Foraker. Río Piedras: Editorial Universitaria.

Ramos, Aarón.
1980. "The Development of Annexationist Politics in Twentieth Century Puerto Rico." In Adalberto López ed., The Puerto Ricans: Their History, Culture, and Society. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman Publishing Co., Inc.

Ramos de Santiago, Carmen.
1970a. El desarrollo constitucional de Puerto Rico. Universidad de Puerto Rico, Editorial Universitaria.
1970b. El gobierno de Puerto Rico. Universidad de Puerto Rico, Editorial Universitaria.

Ramos Mattei, Andrés A.
1982. "El liberto en el régimen de trabajo azucarero de Puerto Rico." In A.A. Ramos Mattei, ed., Azúcar en Esclavitud. Río Piedras: Universidad de Puerto Rico.

Rashdall, Hasting.
1936. The University of Europe in the Middle Ages. 3 vols. Oxford, England: The Clarendon Press.

Reid, Charles F.
1941. Education in the Territories and Outlying Possessions of the United States. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers' College, Columbia University.

Reimer, Everett.
1971. School is Dead: Alternatives in Education. Garden City: Doubleday & Company.

Reitner, Rayna, ed.
1978. Toward an Anthropology of Women. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Rivera Quintero, Marcia.
1979. Capitalist Development and the Incorporation of Women into the Labour Force. Río Piedras: CEREP.

Rodríguez Bou, Ismael.
1966. "Significant Factors in the Development of Education in Puerto Rico." In U.S.-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico, Status of Puerto Rico, pp. 147-314.

Rosario, José Colombán y Justina Carrión.
1940. El Negro: Haití-Estados Unidos-Puerto Rico. San Juan: Negociado de Materiales, Imprenta y Transporte.

Rowe, L.S.
1904. The United States and Porto Rico. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co.

Sahlins, Marshall.
1976. Culture and Practical Reason. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Scarano, Francisco A., ed.
1981. Immigración y clases sociales en el Puerto Rico del siglo XIX. Río Piedras: Ediciones Huracán.

Schermerhorn, R.A.
1978. Comparative Ethnic Relations: A Framework for Theory and Research. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Schroyer, Trent.
1975. The Critique of Domination. Boston: Beacon Press.

Sellés Solá, Gerardo.
1943. Lecturas Históricas de la Educación en Puerto Rico. Universidad de Puerto Rico.

Silén, Juan A.
1973. Historia de la nación puertorriqueña. Río Piedras: Editorial Edil.
1978. Apuntes para la historia del movimiento obrero puertorriqueño. Río Piedras: Editorial Cultural, Inc.

Silvestrini de Pacheco, Blanca.
1979. Los trabajadores puertorriqueños y el Partido Socialista. Río Piedras: Editorial Universitaria.
1980. "La mujer puertorriqueña y el movimiento obrero en la década de 1930." In Edna Acosta Belén, ed., La Mujer en la Sociedad Puertorriqueña. Río Piedras: Ediciones Huracán, pp. 67-90.

Smith, Glenn.
1969. "John Eaton, Educator (1829-1906)." In School and Society, 97 (2315), pp. 108-112.

Spring, Joel H.
1972. Education and the Rise of the Corporate State. Boston: Beacon Press.
1975. A Primer of Libertarian Education. New York: Free Life Editions.

Stein, Stanley J., and Barbara H.
1970. La herencia colonial de América Latina. México: Siglo XXI Editores.

Steward, Julian H., et al.
1956. The People of Puerto Rico. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Stone, Lawrence.
1969. "Literacy and Education in England 1640-1900." In Past & Present, (42), pp. 69-139.

Sued Badillo, Jalil.
1978. Los caribes: Realidad o fábula. Río Piedras: Ediciones Antillana.
1979. La Mujer Indígena y su Sociedad. Río Piedras: Editorial Antillana.

Sussman, Leila.
1965. High School to University in Puerto Rico. Río Piedras: Social Science Research Center, University of Puerto Rico.
1972. "Democratization and Class Segregation in Puerto Rican Schooling: The U.S. Model Transplanted." In Thomas J. La Belle, ed., Education and Development: Latin America and the Caribbean. Los Angeles: Latin American Census, University of California, pp. 319-340.

Tapia y Rivera, Alejandro.
1945. Biblioteca Historica de Puerto Rico. San Juan: Instituto de Literatura Puertorriqueña.
1971. Mis memorias o Puerto Rico como lo encontré y como lo dejo. Río Piedras: Editorial Edil, Inc.

Torres Ramírez, Bibiano.
1968. La Isla de Puerto Rico, 1765-1800. San Juan:

Instituto de Cultura Puertorriqueña.
Trías Monge, José.
1980-1981, Historia Constitucional de Puerto Rico. 2 vols. Rio Piedras: Editorial Universitaria.
Tyack, David B.
1974. The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Unger, Roberto Mangabeira.
1976. Knowledge and Politics. New York: The Free Press.
U.S. Bureau of the Census.
1910-1940. Census of the United States. Washington: Government Printing Office.
U.S. House of Representatives.
1899. Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1897-1898. Vol. I. 55th Congress, 3rd Session, House Document 5, Washington: Government Printing Office.
1900a. Report of Brigadier-General George W. Davis on Civil Affairs of Puerto Rico; Annual Reports of the War Department for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1899. 56th Congress, 1st Session, House Document 2, Washington: Government Printing Office.
1900b. Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1898-1899. Vol. I. 56th Congress, 1st Session, House Document 5, Washington: Government Printing Office.
1900c. Report of the Commissioner of Eeucation for Puerto Rico; Annual Reports of the Department of the Interior, Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1900. 56th Congress, 2nd Session, Washington: Government Printing Office.
1901. "Education in Porto Rico." In Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1899-1900. 56th Congress, 2nd Session, House Document 5, Washington: Government Printing Office.
1902. Report of the Military Governor of Porto Rico; Annual Reports of the War Department for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1900. 56th Congress, 2nd Session, House Document 2, Washington: Government Printing Office.
U.S. Senate.
1900. "Education in Porto-Rico." 56h Congress, 1st Session, Senate Document 363, Washington: Government Printing Office.
U.S. War Department.
1899. Annual Report of the Secretary of War for the Year 1899. Washington: Government Printing Office.
1900a. Report on the Census of Porto-Rico 1899. Washington: Government Printing Office.
1900b. Report on the Census of Cuba. Washington: Government Printing Office.
1901. "Report of the Commissioner of Education."

In First Annual Report of the Governor of Porto Rico. Washington: Government Printing Office.
1902. "Report of the Commissioner of Education." In Second Annual Report of the Governor of Porto Rico. Washington: Government Printing Office.
1903. "Report of the Commissioner of Education." In Third Annual Report of the Governor of Porto Rico Washington: Government Printing Office.
1907. "Report of the Commissioner of Education." In Annual Report of the Governor of Porto Rico, 1907. Washington: Government Printing Office.
1909a. "Report of the Commissioner of Education." In Annual Report of the Governor of Porto Rico, 1908. Washington: Government Printing Office.
1909b. Annual Report: Report of the Governor of Porto Rico, 1909. Washington: Government Printing Office.
1930a. "Report of the Commissioner of Education." In Twenty-ninth Annual Report of the Governor of Puerto Rico, 1929. Washington: Government Printing Office.
1930b. "Report of the Commissioner of Education." pp. 99-116. In Thirtieth Annual Report of the Governor of Porto Rico, 1930. Washington: Government Printing Office.

Valle, Norma.
1980. "El feminismo y su manifestación en las organizaciones de mujeres en Puerto Rico." In Edna Acosta Belén, La mujer en la sociedad puertorriqueña. Río Piedras: Ediciones Huracán, pp. 91-107.

Vázquez, José L.
1968. "El crecimiento poblacional de Puerto Rico 1943 al presente." In Revista de Ciencias Sociales, 12 (1), pp. 5-22.

Vicens Vives, Jaime.
1959. Manual de Historia Economica de España. Barcelona: Editorial Teide.
1967. Approaches to the History of Spain. Berkeley: University of California Press.
1972. Historia social y económica de España y América. 5 vols. Barcelona: Editorial Vicens-Vives.

Vila Vilar, Enriqueta.
1974. Historia de Puerto Rico (1600-1650). Sevilla: Escuela de Estudios Hispano-Americanos.

Vilar, Pierre.
1967. Spain: A Brief History. New York: Pergamon Press.

Wallerstein, Immanuel.
1974. The Modern World-System 1: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy on the Sixteenth Century. New York: Academic Press.

1979. The Capitalist World-Economy. New York: Cambridge University Press.
1980. The Modern World-System II: Mercantilism and the Consolidation of the European World-Economy 1600-1750. New York: Academic Press.

Walker, Pat, ed.
1979. Between Labor and Capital. Boston: South End Press.

Warren, Donald.
1974. To Enforce Education: A History of the Founding Years of the United States Office of Education. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Weinberg, Albert K.
1935. Manifest Destiny: A Study of Nationalist Expansion in American History. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press.

Weinstein, James.
1968. The Corporate Ideal in the Liberal State 1900-1919. Boston: Beacon Press.

Wellmer, Albrecht.
1974. Critical Theory of Society. New York: The Seabury Press.

Williams, Raymond.
1965. The Long Revolution. Ontario: Penguin Books.
1976. Keywords. Glasgow: Fontana/Croom Helm.
1977. Marxism and Literature. New York: Oxford University Press.
1981. The Sociology of Culture. New York: Schocken Books.

Williams, William Appleman.
1969. The Roots of the Modern American Empire. New York: Random House.
1972. The Tragedy of American Diplomacy. New York: Dell Publishing Co.
1978. Americans in a Changing World: A History of the United States in the Twentieth Century. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Young, Michael.
1958. The Rise of the Meritocracy. London: Thames and Hudson.

Zinn, Howard.
1980. A People's History of the United States. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.